The Mass and the Redemption

M. C. D'ARCY S.J.

Class 265.322 D243 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/massredemption0000revm

THE
MASS AND THE REDEMPTION

THE MASS AND THE REDEMPTION

By

REV. M. C. D'ARCY, S.J.

LONDON
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.
PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE
1926

265.322 A
D243
80733

IMPRIMI POTEST SI IIS AD QUOS PERTINET VIDEBITUR :

GULIELMUS BODKIN, S.J.,
Praep. Prov. Angliae.

ROEHAMPTONII,
Die 17a Aprilis, 1926.

NIHIL OBSTAT :

EDUARDUS MAHONEY, S.T.D.,
Censor deputatus.

IMPRIMATUR:

EDM. CAN. SURMONT,
Vicarius generalis.

WESTMONASTERII,
Die 9a Augusti, 1926.

Made and Printed in Great Britain



PREFACE

ST PAUL tells us that he preached Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Gentiles folly, but to those who believe, the power and the wisdom of God. I have attempted in the following pages to show how the latter part of this statement is verified in the Mass. And in doing this I have had two main objects in mind—the first is to make clear the essential function of the Mass in the plan of the Redemption; the second is an inference from this—the inference that any creed or form of Christianity which leaves out the Mass is not an authentic version but a mutilated copy.

All Catholics are aware that the Mass is the centre-piece in Catholic worship; but so sublime is its doctrinal value that they may be at a loss to explain it fittingly to themselves. To do this properly the explanation must introduce the truths of grace and the supernatural life, and the Mystical Body; and the very mention of these terms disconcerts some and fills them with nervous apprehension. To prevent this I have taken the Mass as the " Open Sesame." After

all, we know the Mass, and it may be easier by proceeding from that knowledge to understand what seems mysterious than *vice versa*. The method is justified because the Mass does contain within it the fundamental mysteries of the Catholic Faith, and it will help us to make vivid to ourselves the Creed and the duties of the Faith. Part will fit with part; the incredible love of Christ will be revealed, and the more than astonishing perfection of his handiwork in establishing the Church will convince us that we belong to a divine organisation, distinct from any other made by human hands. Here we touch on the second object of this work—its apologetic character. Apologists are bound by the very nature of the attack upon the Church to take objection after objection, to confine themselves to one point and prove the falsity of the objection and the credibility of the doctrine attacked. But apologists are permitted to use also another method, to paint the everlasting beauty of "the city set on a hill." They can say with Christ, "Come and see"; and as the onlooker looks he will find his mind captivated by the truth; he will cry out: "The finger of God is here," and the all too human rival religions and copies of Christianity will, without hesitation or controversy, be set aside as counterfeit.

The theory of the Mass proposed in these pages is that of Père M. de la Taille, S.J., the author of *Mysterium Fidei*. I am beholden throughout to this great work, and have quite shamelessly borrowed from it. Indeed, this small volume is to some degree an English synopsis of *Mysterium Fidei*, though I have given it a different setting.[1]

This setting is that of the Redemption. That is to say, I have tried to look at the Redemption in the light of this theory of the Mass. Père de la Taille is naturally concerned to prove his view, apodeictically as a thesis, and it would have appeared grandiose to him to have enlarged the plan of his work so as to have included the whole of the Redemption. But what is not permitted in a technical theological treatise may be permissible in a work of a different genre like this. I am unable, therefore, to state exactly where

[1] The theory of de la Taille can be found in the volume of Cambridge Lectures on the Holy Eucharist; also in Père de la Taille's answer to critics and in several other articles in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* and *Blackfriars*. Except for the first, these writings are controversial and differ, therefore, from the exposition of this book. The fact that the theory has been controverted need not cause the reader anxiety, as I do not think it has suffered any damage. Besides, I hope that the reader will find in these pages sufficient evidence for him to form a fair judgement himself.

and when I have departed from the thought of Père de la Taille except in certain obvious places. To tell the truth, I have so identified myself with the views expressed by him that they have subconsciously ceased to be other than personal. At the same time, and perhaps particularly for this reason, Père de la Taille is not to be held responsible for views expounded in these pages which may prove to be erroneous or extravagant. Such weaknesses are to be attributed to myself.

I have said that this book is an attempt to give an outline of the Redemption. This might be thought waste of time and space, as the centuries of theological thought—let alone the Catechism—make it clear. But there are varying degrees of clearness, and there are ways of presenting one fact—especially if it be a divine overflowing fact—suited to one age more than another. The history of the Church shows that, within an identity of teaching and Faith, one facet of the truth can be more in evidence in one age than another—popular devotion may be drawn to one group of dogmas and, in an unessential, obscure the brightness of others, and so diminish the perfectly rounded beauty of the Church which is the continuation of Christ. This tendency is most apparent since the Reformation. The growing complexity of details of doctrine—the

clash of battle, and attention to the weapons most serviceable to repel attack—have caused some of the insignia of the Catholic religion to lie hidden in the treasury. The analytical proclivities of certain theologians, excellent in their own season, have perhaps divided up articles of Faith so that the beauty they mutually borrow has been hidden; and, lastly, the devotions of the faithful have been necessarily coloured by the atmosphere of the age and often stunted, as Christian art has been poisoned by the ugliness of the lot of the poor since the coming of the industrial era. Readers of Léon Bloy or Huysmans will remember the lava eloquence of the one and the studied raillery of the other against the plaster art and sticky devotion of the period. But what lay behind the devotion was the, at times, excessive as well as sentimental attachment to what is a truth of Christian religion, but only a partial truth; I mean the Redemption seen in its most pitiful aspect. Our Lord is contemplated by his children as the sufferer who has wiped away our sins, who is still reproachful, with the words " Quae utilitas in sanguine meo ?" ever on his lips, and in point of fact still suffering. In the immortal words of Pascal: " Jésus sera en agonie jusqu'à la fin du monde ! il ne faut pas dormir pendant ce temps-là." I remember once

when a friend pointed out those words to me in great exultation, protesting to him that, however magnificent, they were not true and that they were the words of a Jansenist, not a Catholic. This is indeed an exaggeration, for the words bear a true sense—but it is not the literal sense—and a certain subtle simplicity is required, which, thank God, Catholics usually possess, to adjust the paradox contained in them. For Christ suffereth no more, and time must be made a matter of no account, if we are to understand the Agony of Gethsemani as pervading all subsequent time. The living faith of Christians and the Mass enable them to do this, to see the incidents of our Lord's life as divine facts ever present by some profound eschatology warranted by Christ's own words about his coming; or, to put it in another way, Christians usually find little difficulty in stepping back across the centuries and taking their place with the disciples at Galilee or in the Garden or beneath the cross. This practice and habit of mind is justified as long as there are souls to be saved and suffering members of Christ in the world, but on one condition, that a corresponding truth be not forgotten—namely, the Resurrection of Christ and all that that entails. The object of our love and worship is a victim, but he is also the glorified victim

risen from the grave, who no longer weeps nor suffers agony. He is the Lord of Grace, the Head of the Mystical Body which is risen with him after having been baptised into his death.

This, it may be said, is so true and obvious that there is no need to dwell on it with any emphasis; but I fear that the deductions from it are not as often kept in mind as they should be, with the result that a something very like error may creep into an individual's spiritual life. The great truths of our Faith hang from this fundamental one of the Victim of Calvary risen from the dead; and though some of them will be treated in more detail later on, it may be well to contrast the consequences of a clear comprehension of its importance with a failure to do so. I speak now of an extreme which is not actual indeed among properly instructed Catholics, though it is, I fear, not uncommon outside the Church, where the position is like that of the catechumens of whom St Augustine said that they saw the sign and could draw a superficial meaning from it, but as to the interior significance of the Catholic rites they were in the dark. In fact, the distinction I am trying to draw might well be classified as that between the catechumen and the initiate. The catechumen will think of our Lord and be stirred to love, admiration, and

sympathy with his virtues and his sufferings. He will see that he is in part responsible and be aware, too, that his sins stand in the way of loving intercourse and place him in danger of an eternal separation. But he will recall that Christ is also his Saviour, and that he has promised help to those who invoke him, that his grace is always at hand, if there be willingness to accept it. The Redemption, then, for him means principally his rescue from a certain damnation and an assistance to keep him from offending God in his lonely struggle, ever to be kept up till the dread moment of death. He is still a suppliant for grace and anxious about the future, and this anxiety of his in his thought communicates itself to our Lord, so that there is a mingling of pity for Christ's wistful appeal to himself and others, with a somewhat fearful and scared heartsick concern for his own salvation. Throughout, it will be noticed, the attitude is what one human being would have towards another, and it is worked out in human wise in terms of a relationship which has nothing very mysterious or transcendent in it. Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament will be the lonely, downcast prisoner of Love, and the Mass will be on the whole a Sorrowful Mystery, a sacrifice unbloody, indeed, but otherwise dark with the

darkness of Calvary; while Holy Communion, in fine, is so detached in its significance from the Mass that it is received indifferently in the Liturgy, or outside it altogether.

So much for what I have called the catechumen attitude of mind. In contrast with it the initiate has the mind of Christ and knows what it is to be called a son of God, to be an heir, co-heir with Christ to the unspeakable riches of the kingdom. It is impossible for him, because of his realisation of the precise significance of the Mass, to forget that our Lord is in the Blessed Sacrament in his risen state, as one who suffers no more, but bearing the character and condition of victim—the Glorious Victim. (The condition of victim is the justification of the catechumen's thought of our Lord as the Prisoner of the Tabernacle.) The Resurrection of Christ is no chance epilogue to the Passion; it is the firstfruits of the Redemption, the ratification of the Sacrifice, and the opening of the floodgates of grace, of the new life which comes in under the new dispensation. The Christ whom St Paul salutes is the Plenitude, the Giver of a new gift, of supernatural life. He is, as St John tells us, full of grace and truth. We are born again by baptism into this new life, are made new creatures, and the old things are passed away, and in a sense we know not Christ

according to the flesh, though we know him most intimately by participation of his risen Body and Blood. So far from contemplating a still suffering pitiable Lord and appearing before him as suppliants with fear in our hearts, palsied with an anxiety for our salvation, we know that grace is not only an actual help, but an interior habitual gift, translating us out of the kingdom of darkness and fear into the kingdom of his light wherein we rejoice in his continual presence and abide as children of his family in faith and hope. We belong to his Mystical Body, and are as branches of the vine. The grace which is his gift is a potion of immortality—in fact, the preparatory draught of the nuptial feast with the Lamb in the beatific vision. Heaven is no longer separated from earth by an impassable gulf, but is our possession now by faith, which is the substance if not the experience of things hoped for. Instead, then, of putting the issue of salvation to a dread future moment as the catechumen does, the initiate comprehends the startling words of St Paul in the opening chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians: " Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ. As he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unspotted

in his light in charity. Who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto himself; according to the purpose of his will."[1] These ringing words tell us that those of us who are Catholics have been freely chosen by God of his own bounty, and that it is our own fault entirely if we throw away that inheritance instead of " speaking to ourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in our hearts to the Lord, giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to God and the Father."[2]

This short outline, which will be filled in to some extent later on, must suffice to show the importance of the Resurrection in the Christian scheme and in the outlook of every Catholic. The doctrine of the Cross is paradoxical, for the preaching of Christ crucified is to those who believe the indication of the power and wisdom of God. The Cross is, indeed, a symbol of sorrow—of the sorrow to which no other was like—and the suffering of Christ is inextricably woven into the life of every Catholic. That is the reason why the Church during Holy Week indulges to the full her grief, and why, too, at times the devotion of the faithful may seem arduous without relief. But the relief is always

[1] Ephes. i 3-5. [2] Ephes. v 19, 20.

there, though it may not always be apparent, nor fully appreciated. The richness of the Catholic Faith is in its combination of the Passion and the Resurrection—a combination seen admirably in the office for the Feast of the Finding of the True Cross. "The Sign of the Cross will be in the sky, Alleluia, when the Lord shall come to judge, Alleluia." The Vesper hymn, *Vexilla Regis*, tells of the coming forth of the Standard of the King—the shining of the mystery of the Cross—the Cross whereon life suffered death and by that death gave birth to life. Death and life, these are the twin facts of the Redemption. There is the price paid, the atonement given, the salvation wrought by the Cross. But that salvation is more than a snatching from death, a saving of one's soul, as the common formula has it. The salvation foreseen in prophecy has a specific character: it is the incorporation into Christ, and the Resurrection signifies this new Adam risen from the grave where the sins of the old Adam and his descendants were buried, the new head of that Mystical Body whereof we are members. A new solidarity in Christ—a new race shares in the divine nature through Christ risen. This is in sum what the Redemption means, and the following pages have for an end to show how this doctrine shines forth in the liturgy of the Mass.

Pulchritudo tam antiqua sed tam nova! The ancient beauty of the Christian Faith in the risen Victim shines forth with ever-increasing light. One can almost watch the Holy Spirit, who disposes of all things sweetly, preparing the minds of the faithful for a richer understanding and appreciation of the Eucharist. Theologians are attracted more and more to the subjects of sanctifying grace and the Mystical Body. Chosen souls of God are directed to sanctify themselves along the way of the Eucharist and receive special graces in return for their devotion. New congregations form themselves with the object of perpetual adoration. Pius X restores the practice of frequent Communion. Quarant' Ores, Holy Hours, Eucharistic Leagues and Congresses, become familiar to Catholics in all parts of the globe. The youth of the world muster as Knights and Handmaids of the Blessed Sacrament, and finally a work of the first order appears which simplifies the theory of the Mass in accordance with the ancient traditions of the Church, emphasises the connection between the risen life of Christ, the Mystical Body and the daily sacrifice, and gives a setting of incomparable beauty to that mystery of our Faith which has been drawing the hearts of Catholics to it so potently in these latter days.

I owe a debt of profound gratitude to my friend the Rev. B. Gurrin, S.J., who, in my absence from England, undertook the correction of the MS. and of the proofs, and also took upon himself all the trouble involved in the arrangements for the publication of this book.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	PREFACE	V
CHAPTER I.	"THE REDEMPTION"	1
II.	THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST	40
III.	THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	58
IV.	THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS—*continued*	77
V.	CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	91
VI.	THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH	110
VII.	THE CHRISTIAN LIFE	126

THE MASS AND THE REDEMPTION

CHAPTER I

"THE REDEMPTION"

THE meaning of the Redemption is naturally familiar to all Catholics who have been instructed in their religion. Nevertheless, there may be statements of it varying in profundity and clear-sightedness. Correctness does not always imply perfect comprehension, and, as we all know, faith gives new insight while intellect gives substance and vigour to that faith. As a method, then, of discussing our shortcomings, readjusting the articles of our faith, and so reaching towards a fuller understanding of its rich content and its unity, let us begin by proposing answers to the meaning of the Redemption in an ascending order of completeness.

And first, to point the contrast, mention may suitably be made of a very inadequate view—a view, in fact, which scarcely deserves the name of Christian at all, although it finds favour unfortunately in certain high places of learning and

is held vaguely by many outside the Catholic Church. According to this view man was out of touch with God and in the darkness mentally and morally. At the same time his better self longed for a union with God. This longing has been made possible by the advent of Jesus Christ, the man in whom the divine has been most perfectly manifested. He, by his example and his love, is the way to true life.

This statement I have made as vague as possible on purpose, and on that account it may appear a mere travesty of a not uncommon creed. Let us, then, fill in the picture with appropriate Christian terms. Men were in darkness through original and actual sin. To escape from the law of sin and Satan, a Redeemer was needed, and this Redeemer was Christ the Son of God. By faith in him, through the merits of the Cross, they obtain salvation. They are legally justified and treated as co-heirs with Christ.

This creed, so to call it, sounds far more in harmony with the traditional teaching of Christendom, and yet it is only on the border-line of truth. It is distressingly vague, and judgement on its value will depend on the meaning really attached to the theological terms used. For, after all, many might recite this creed, and yet on being asked the meaning of original sin, faith, and the

Son of God, they would fall back on vagueness and fare hardly better than those who followed the first view enunciated.

Rationalism has unfortunately made havoc of the old meanings attached to Christian technical words, and round the dead relics sentiment has gathered which dupes itself by singing the old songs of Sion unaware that the Babylonian has defiled them and made them meaningless. For the rationalist who is still allowed to deck himself in the surplice and gown of an established Church or to adapt old beliefs to new philosophies for sincere and earnest-minded Nonconformists, has relegated original sin and Satan to the lumber-room of superstition, reduced faith to an emotion not justified by argument, and thrown a halo of doubt round the sacred personage of Christ. At best those who will not proclaim without doubting the divinity of Christ, the fact of sin, original and actual, and the certainty of hell and heaven, are left with but a natural religion of piety. They have a purely human attachment to a beloved figure, whose body has wasted away in the grave. They live on a memory with the future hope that the words of Scripture may still avail to warm the heart.

The true Protestant, be he Anglican or Nonconformist, who knows what rationalism is, will

undoubtedly reject with horror such an interpretation of Christianity. He is at one with the Catholic in his belief in the Scriptures and in the divinity of the Founder of the Christian religion. Where he differs from the Catholic is in his view of the foundation laid by Christ. The Catholic, on the other hand, knows well the articles of his Faith, but if asked why Christians scandalise the unbeliever by quarrelling over, say, the jurisdiction of the Pope and trifling when the world is perishing, he would answer quite rightly that men cannot tamper with God's revelation, but he might not see that his beliefs are indissolubly connected, and that each is in a sense as fundamental as another. The Pope's infallibility, for instance, round which controversy rages, is one link in a long chain of dogmas, or, better, one part of a living body. If the Redemption be adequately understood, it will be seen how organic to it this last disputed dogma is, and how characteristic of the mind of Christ.

The degree, therefore, of truth and insufficiency in the following summary of the Redemption will be readily seen. God created Adam and Eve in grace. They sinned. Because of that sin all their descendants were born in original sin, the harmony of their nature was disturbed, and they were made subject to death, the wages of sin.

But God in his infinite mercy sent his only-begotten Son to atone for that infinite outrage committed against the majesty of God by sin. This he did by suffering as a victim for mankind on Calvary. By his merits he gained pardon for us, and opened the way through himself to salvation. That way he made to be his Church, the ark of salvation. That Church is the authentic witness of Christ, the teacher which continues and will continue to repeat till the end of time the message of God. It is the repository of the graces won for us by the Redeemer, offering us the means of holiness by the sacraments, and demanding obedience to the rule of life given by it.

The truth and defects of this statement will be immediately noticed. Most will recognise their own beliefs, though they might prefer to put them in a different way. Most, again, will feel that the supernatural life of grace is left in the background, and that the institution of the Church appears almost as an afterthought or appendage to the redemption instead of being its fulfilment and end, lighting up that redemption by the splendour of its plan.

To introduce the life of grace is indeed to light the lamps within the Temple of God, his Church, and the beauty of its designing distinguishes it

from any human building. The life of grace it is which Adam and Eve possessed as a gift and threw away, and it was to restore that supernatural life that Christ endured the shame of the Cross. The place now of the Resurrection, of the Mystical Body the Church, and of the Sacraments, becomes apparent. God destined the first Adam to a share in the life of the Trinity itself. Not content with leaving him with a human and natural enjoyment of himself, he wished Adam to have the privileges of divine sonship. He gave Adam a gift by right of which he would after trial be admitted to see the divine beauty as it is in itself, and this gift was grace. Adam rejected this gift, and as a consequence after the Fall and by the time of the Incarnation man had little to show save his natural weakness and his sin. To restore the gift to man Christ therefore had a double task—he had to atone for sins and give back the supernatural life. The first he accomplished by his death, by taking the handwriting of the sentence that was against us and nailing it to the Cross.[1] . . . The second he accomplished by uniting us to himself, by becoming the new Adam risen from the grave of the old; the first brother among many brethren, glorified by the Father and full of grace in his

[1] Coloss. ii 14.

sight. Acting as representative in his human nature, he took us with him through the furnace of death and brought us out of it new creatures, sons of God; or, as St Paul puts it, we were baptised unto his death, that we might rise with him.[1] Hence the Christian is of the race of Christ, united with him as the branches of the vine with the Vine; incorporated in him, as limbs of a new body of which the Head is Christ. This new and royal race, coheirs with Christ to eternal happiness by consort with the life of the Trinity, is the Church, a compact unity, therefore, which it is a sacrilege to tear by schism, a holy people holy with the holiness of Christ's Body, hierarchic as indissolubly connected with the High Priest who entered the Holy of Holies winning eternal redemption, continuing his jurisdiction through all time, and finally living and growing in him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Now in this account we have passed from mere external impressions to the very life of Christianity—the life of grace. But for those who are at home in the Church and have experienced the warmth of its family life and the joy of its mysteries, the Mass and the Sacraments, the language about grace and the Mystical Body,

[1] Rom. vi 3, 4.

however splendid, seems somewhat abstract, almost an anæmic philosophical statement when compared with our Lord's own words: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever"; and still more when the priest in the daily sacrifice echoes the High Priest in saying, "This is my Body; this is my Blood of the New Testament." In the light, then, of the most intimate mystery of the Church, the Eucharist, let us try and state the Catholic Faith. We must keep all that was said in the preceding description and add to it but one new ingredient, the frankincense of the Mass.

God so loved men that he gave them his beloved Son. The motive behind all God's action from the creation of Adam in grace to the restoration of man in Christ and the foundation of the Church, was love. And love is a form of union, the desire in intellectual beings for union of soul. Among men and women composed of body and soul, marriage is the expression and natural culmination of love; but, be it noticed, marriage takes its place in the hierarchy of creation as the appropriate mode of union for man, and therefore as a symbol and window whence the very nature of love in its source and perfections can be descried. As St Paul said, "It is a sacra-

ment, a symbol of the higher union of Christ with the Church."[1]

Now God, not content with giving man a nature wherewith he could enjoy a certain union with his Maker limited by his own powers of comprehension and love, gave him a new form of life by the power of which after trial he would be able to enjoy God in a manner which was, so to speak, private to the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity. How exactly that happened with Adam we do not know, save that it was by grace—a word which denotes a free gift added to the natural endowments of man. Adam threw away this gift, and it was given back through Christ, and this time the word " grace " appears again, and we are in a position to understand it in the setting of Christ the Redeemer. With all rever-

[1] Marriage is often used by spiritual writers as a metaphor, a symbol to describe the love of God for the soul, or for his Church, but the significance of marriage will be partly missed unless we start the other way about. God's love is such, that what is ineffable in divine relations is fittingly and analogously described by marriage in human relations. The reality of union coming down the scale of being is seen most clearly in marriage. That is God's way of making known his own nature. Marriage, therefore, is not the standard, the perfection wherewith to judge divine love and union, but the divine love and union being the standard and pattern stamps all grades of finite loves with its image.

ence we may call the Redemption the answer to a problem which the Holy Trinity had to set before itself. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost existing in indissoluble union, by the mutual love of the Father and Son which is the Holy Ghost, the link and marriage-bed of union, had to introduce the finite creature man into their divine life, without destruction of man's separate and personal existence, and at the same time break down the extra wall of partition erected by sin.

The latter demanded atonement, satisfaction; the former required the apparently impossible co-existence of humanity with infinity in a creature. To solve this problem was a work worthy of God, and the solution would bear unmistakable marks of the divine workmanship, setting the religion which sprang from it in lonely grandeur apart from any other religion claiming to be divinely instituted. The solution, as we know, was, and is, Christ.

The first act in the story is the Incarnation. God the Son took to himself a human nature, body and soul, but that human nature, though complete, had never any existence of its own, for it belonged to the Person of the Son. It was human, and therefore representative of man's state; because it was owned by the Second Person,

by right it participated in the divine life of the Trinity. But the difficulty still remained. How unite a human nature which belonged to an *individual* person with the Trinity ? for our Lord's human nature had no distinct finite personality. If Christ could make us as close to him as his own Body was, by a union not hypostatic but nevertheless productive of the privileges of the hypostatic union, the solution would be reached; and this was accomplished, and, moreover, by one and the same act whereby an atonement was made for us in the Redemption.

The Redemption is like a diptych—on one panel we see Christ the scapegoat of the world suffering death, on the other we see the same Victim living though slain, and giving life to the world, and the human nature of Christ is the medium in this twofold operation. As representative of man it suffered the punishment by proxy which all deserved. The sacrifice of Calvary is the propitiation made, in which Christ is both High Priest and Victim. In a certain sense all sinners followed Christ on the road to Golgotha; their vices were put to death in the flesh of the Mediator, and by the suffering of One, salvation came to many. " Mors et vita duello conflixere mirando. Dux vitae mortuus."

But now turn to the second panel of the diptych

—*Regnat vivus*. That very death which is the consequence of sin, its wages, is also the gate of life, the wages of manumission. It is pontifical death, the supreme sacrifice of the High Priest which is the bridge between the human and the divine. That human nature which was made the Victim of the Sacrifice is accepted by the Father, and the pledge and guarantee of this acceptance is the Resurrection from the grave of that identical human nature—victimised indeed, and bearing for ever the marks of the wounds in hands and feet and side—but glorious in the radiance of divine life. Here is the mysterious but marvellous solution of the problem. Christ is risen, and his human nature, his crucified body, has become the vivifying principle of mankind. As it had the burden of bearing the sins of the world, of being representative of fallen man, so now it has the privilege of its labour. "Euntes ibant et flebant mittentes semina sua: venientes venient cum exultatione portantes manipulos suos."[1] It remains representative; but now, no longer is Christ in the form of a slave, the old Adam, for he is the firstfruits of the dead, the begetter of a new life, which is contained in him and overflowing on all who die to sin by baptism and rise with him. "For Christ being come a

[1] Ps. cxxv.

high priest of the good things to come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle . . . by his own blood, entered once into the Holies having obtained eternal redemption. . . . And therefore he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of his death for the redemption of those transgressions which were under the former testament, they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance."[1]

It is now I say that we discover the innermost secret of the Redemption, and behold the accomplishment of that object, which seemed to tax even God's omnipotence. The Son of God has made reparation for sin in his victimised *body*, and that sacrifice being acceptable has brought as its reward the transfiguration of that body and the uplifting with it of all mankind, if they but choose to belong to Christ. The human nature of Christ is glorified and full of grace, and other finite individuals are graced too, but how? The answer is simple, but divine in its conception and in its working out, for it is by incorporation in Christ, by communion with the all-holy Body and Blood of the Redeemer.

A mother feeds her babe from the breast, and her milk is the nourishment which is transformed into the flesh of the child. Christ, too, feeds us,

[1] Heb. ix 11, 12, 15.

and with his own body and blood; but this food is not assimilated to that life of ours so much lower in comparison with his. We are transformed into him and become identical[1] with that higher principle of life that is part of that new body of his which grows with the extension of his Church, and is not yet, as St Paul tells us, complete. It is meet that a higher form of life should assume a lower form of life into its own being, and so Christ can truly say, in the words put on his lips by St Augustine (*Confess.*, vii, c. 10, *n.* 16): " I am the nourishment of great souls; grow and you shall be able to feed on me, but you will not change me into you, as into bodily food; it is you that will be changed into me." In the catacombs a favourite design is of a young unbearded shepherd who leads his flock " in pascua "; the " pascua " are the body and blood of the shepherd, who gives his life for his sheep.

And so, without absorption, without any shade of Pantheism, the Christian is made a sharer in the divine nature. The Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost have one divine incommunicable nature; and the Son has also a human nature

[1] Identical, that is, so far as a relation between persons can be identical. Complete absorption would, of course, destroy the union, so the word " mystical " is used to signify the perseverance of personal life in human beings.

hypostatically united to his divinity, and, moreover, a Mystical Body united through his human nature to himself, but composed of free, independent human persons. The link, as has been said, is the human nature of Christ. By that human nature which is personally united to God, free, independent persons are united also to God, since that flesh and that blood assume the lower life of man into Christ, without detriment to the *individual.* Justly, the Church in the epistle for the feast of the Resurrection takes St Paul's words, with their significant allusion to bread—the species of the Eucharist: " Purge out the old leaven that you may be a new paste as you are unleavened, for Christ our Pasch is sacrificed. Therefore . . . let us feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth " (1 Cor. v 7).

Now, if this be true, we shall find that many sayings and images as well as incidents take on a new meaning. We might expect to find references to the Eucharist hidden or in the form of parables; or, again, images chosen not only for the occasion, but because of their suggestion of the Bread of Life; or, lastly, an intermingling and compenetration of texts concerning grace, life, incorporation, and the Eucharist. Now, that this occurs we can show by way of illustration from the celebrated discourse of our Lord in the sixth

chapter of St John. From this discourse a decisive argument is drawn by Catholics in favour of the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament. The texts used are taken from the latter part of the chapter, and independently of any view about the unity of plan and idea running through the whole discourse, they are so clear and explicit in their teaching that they cannot be explained away. The proof of this can be found in any adequate theological textbook, and calls for no remark here, save this—that, if the discourse not merely in its second portion, but throughout, is concerned with the Eucharist, the proof is, if possible, strengthened, or, at least, criticism loses its one aim.

Catholic commentators are at variance in their analysis of the plan of the discourse. Some have held that the whole is concerned exclusively with the Eucharist, though the first part of it (vv. 26-48 or 51) is less obviously so because our Lord is anxious to show that faith is required for a salutary reception of the Sacrament. The weakness of this view lies in the fact that it does not explain why this first part is apparently so much more figurative and general than the second. Others maintain that the first half is concerned with faith, our Lord demanding faith in himself, the Bread of Heaven; whereas in the second half, beginning at verse 48 or verse 52, our Lord passes

to an explicit declaration of the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament.

Clearly an interpretation which could combine both these views and yet show a more intimate unity in the discourse would be preferable, if such were possible. That it is not only possible, but highly probable, will strike all who consider the text after recalling the place our Lord gave the Eucharist in the scheme of Redemption. Our mode of co-option into the life of the Blessed Trinity is through the human nature of Christ, which suffered for us and is now glorified, and that mode of union is through participation of his flesh. Therefore, our Lord can refer to himself in a more general way as the Life, and, without a break, pass to the particular form in which he is Life—that is, he can speak of himself as the Bread which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world, as the Bread of Life, as Life—and, quite naturally, in the very same speech, pass to the permanent mode, the Eucharist, wherein this truth is realised. The compenetration of the two ideas is well seen in verses 53 and 54. " If any man shall eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever, and the Bread which I shall give is my Flesh for the life of the world "; and again, in the words: " Amen, Amen, I say unto you, except you eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink

his Blood you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." These last words, which are so definite and strong, will bear a straightforward interpretation, if it be true that the Eucharist is the mode of incorporation with Christ. In short, then, Christ is the gate to life—to the supernatural life of union with God—and that gate Christ tells us is his own Body and Blood, which saved us by their pain and received as a reward from the Father the power in their risen state of communicating to us that divine vivifying life which now animates them.

To make this truth still more evident, it will be well to add that it is a habit of St John to conjoin the abstract with the concrete, a habit befitting the author of the " Word made Flesh." He sees in the word " Life " an epitome of the grandeur of the Redemption, but without any break in thought he sees too that Life made incarnate in Jesus Christ, and still more concretely in the Eucharist, the Bread which, being the Life, gives life. Injustice, therefore, is done to the thought of St John, if we split up its rich content and call one constituent of it figurative and another real, or if, as non-Catholic commentators have been known to do, the Sacrament is taken as a mere

symbol of what, after all, is, in their conception, a very vague reality—namely, life as a moral union with Christ. Both the abstract and the concrete are true; they are inseparable and compenetrating.[1] Christ is Life, and, as such, he is the Saviour from the death of sin, the Giver of grace and truth, the object of Faith and Charity; this Life of the World is the Bread of Life, for it is under the species of bread that the Saviour continues as the Victim of the Passion that saved, and as the Glorious Victim who gives life—for unless we eat of that flesh we shall not have life in us.

A difficulty will, nevertheless, no doubt immediately present itself against this interpretation

[1] The same principle should govern the interpretation of certain of the statements of the Fathers on the Eucharist. St Augustine, for instance, is wont to pass, in a manner rather bewildering to the uninitiated, from statements concerning the Blessed Sacrament to what might appear a far more mystical conception of Christ as the Life, or again from the Body of Christ to incorporation with him in the Church. The two ideas were, however, so naturally concordant in his mind that he would have been astonished to hear his language regarded as puzzling, and outraged to hear that it implied a disbelief in the Real Presence or in the Catholic doctrine of to-day. The Eucharist and incorporation belonged to and possessed the same reality; neither was figurative; and to understand how this could be was to have entered fully into the " Mysterium Fidei."

—a difficulty, in fact, which may be urged against the whole theory. The Eucharist cannot be taken as equivalent to incorporation, because Baptism is the Sacrament which has this effect; hence the reception of the Eucharist is not necessary in the same manner as Baptism, and the words of our Lord, " Unless you eat . . ." cannot be taken so strictly.[1] This difficulty is more apparent than real, and can be answered with the help of the principle stated in the interpretation of the sixth chapter of St John. Beyond all question Baptism has as its effect incorporation; but beyond all question, also, the Mass or Eucharist is the central mystery of the Christian faith. If the two, then, be taken as independent of one another, a real difficulty has to be met, but the mistake lies in severing them, a mistake serious indeed, but easy to make, as it is easy to separate the Passion from the Resurrection. The truth, however, is this, that Baptism is indissolubly connected in its significance with the Eucharist, and that like the other Sacraments it is as a satellite round its all-holy light.

It will be remembered that St John speaks of life in one sentence and of the Bread of Life

[1] This difficulty will be examined again later. I touch on it here to bring out the direct significance and symbolism of Baptism.

almost in the next. The second expression is the equivalent of the former; it is the concrete and specific mode of realisation accompanying the more universal summarised in one word. One idea and one Sacrament, as it were, the index of the Redemption. Not that there are not many doctrines and seven sacraments, but the one word " Life " contains in it the saving from sin, faith, charity, union, and the visible bond of unity, the Church, the Mystical Body. Similarly, the one Sacrament, the Eucharist, contains in it the other sacraments, or, if that expression be too loose, since real modes have more relative independence than ideas, the significance of the other sacraments is incomplete without reference to the Sacrament of Life—that is, essential and full life. In other words, since Life is such a rich idea, it is, when examined, found to contain many doctrines and many means or modes of communication. But rightly, the idea and mode which directly signify life-giving have priority of place and appropriate to themselves what also is expressed or given by the others.

If this sound abstract and obscure, it will become clearer when applied to the interconnection of the Eucharist and Baptism. Baptism gives the supernatural life, but, according to the tradition of the Church and the teaching of the

best theologians, it does so not in isolation from the Eucharist, but because of its intimate relation with that Sacrament. The Christian concept of life contains two notes, death to " the old man " and resurrection with Christ into a new life of grace. These two notes are inseparable, for the Redemption is one thing.[1] Therefore, Baptism and the Eucharist are in some sort one; and the efficacy of the Eucharist is felt in Baptism, and Baptism points to the Eucharist and anticipates it in a sense for those who die in infancy.[2] But the primary notion being the positive, the Eucharist

[1] The reader should note well this relation of Baptism to the Eucharist, otherwise certain passages later on in the text (*e.g.*, on pp. 59, 73, 87 and 137) may be misunderstood. In these incorporation and membership of the Mystical Body are ascribed to the Eucharist. Wherever these expressions are found, they are to be read in the light of the explanation given here. That explanation, to repeat, is, shortly, that Baptism has as its effect incorporation; it has this effect not as directly but as indirectly signifying it. The redemptive operation is twofold: it saves from death by death, and gives new life. Baptism directly signifies death and indirectly life. It indirectly signifies life because it contains in it a *votum Eucharistiae* and because the Redemption, though twofold in its effects, is yet one act. It is easy, therefore, to see why incorporation is ascribed (on pp. 33, 73, 87 and 137, among others) to that which gives life directly as its effect, and explains why Baptism gives it indirectly

[2] How this is so will be explained later.

is prior to Baptism. As St Thomas says (3 *S.*, 73, 3, 3m): "Baptism is the sacrament of the death and Passion of Christ, inasmuch as man is regenerated in Christ by virtue of his Passion; but the Eucharist is the Sacrament of the Passion of Christ, inasmuch as man is made perfect in union with the Christ who has endured the Passion"—that is, the Victim. And, therefore, St Thomas teaches that Baptism, in order to be efficacious, must have in it what he calls the "votum" of the Eucharist, for of its nature it looks to the Eucharist, and cannot be separated from it. "By Baptism man is ordinated (*ordinatur*) for the Eucharist, and so from the very fact that children are baptised they are designated for the Eucharist by the Church; and as their act of faith comes from the faith of the Church, so, too, their desire for the Eucharist comes from the will and intention of the Church, and consequently they receive the 'rem ipsius'" (3 *S.*, 73, 3).

And the reason for this is the same as the one already stated. The death of Christ looks to his Resurrection, and Baptism signifies the death, and not directly life. This doctrine is no fantasy of St Thomas's, for it is clearly asserted in St Paul and repeated over and over again by tradition and symbolised in the very ceremony of Baptism.

In the Epistle to the Colossians St Paul tells his readers: You were " buried with Christ in Baptism, in whom also you are risen again by the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him up from the dead."[1] And still more emphatically in the classical passage of Romans: " Know you not that all we who are baptised in Christ Jesus are baptised in his death? For we are buried together with him by baptism into death; that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life."[2] This burial it is which is expressed in the triple immersion in the ceremonies of the early Church to symbolise the three days our Lord's body remained in the tomb. And there is abundant evidence to be drawn from the writings of the first centuries to bear out this view of Baptism. One quotation must suffice, taken not because of the authority of the writer so much as for the appropriateness of the words:[3] " Therefore it is by faith that we are crucified together with Christ to the world, its vices and concupiscences, and in Baptism we are buried together with Christ (and for that reason are we thrice immersed); but by the food of his body

[1] Col. ii 12. [2] Rom. vi 3, 4.

[3] Père de la Taille, pp. 558-571, cites almost all the great names of tradition.

we are incorporated in him" (Honorius Augustodunensis).

To sum up, then, we find that the Eucharist is the condition and means of that new life which is to be led in Christ, and that Baptism signifying our death and burial looks as the Passion does to the glorious risen Lord, whose flesh we must eat in order to possess eternal life. The Passion and Resurrection, the Victim slain and yet risen! The mystery of our redemption with its twofold character—with its two panels—comes home to us through the comparison of the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist.

Of incidents in the New Testament it will be better to reserve till later the Last Supper and the account of the last evening in St John, and pick out those of the forty days after the Resurrection. The somewhat mysterious behaviour of our Lord will be seen to be what one might almost have expected. He speaks of peace and faith and joy, to show that his risen life affects all those who are his friends. He goes disguised and is no longer the constantly visible Companion whose body was subject to fatigue and like in all things save sin to his Apostles'. He bids Mary Magdalen no longer cling to him as in the intimate experiences of past days; he reveals himself in a gesture, in the breaking of bread to the two

disciples, and finally he is hidden from their sight by a cloud. And, nevertheless, he is to be with them all days, and the prophecy at the Last Supper of a unitive life with him has to be fulfilled. The explanation of this is that he is now onward to be visible in his Mystical Body, to which he will give increase hidden under the forms of bread and wine. He is to be on our altars for all time, as a glorious Victim, for he was careful to show the doubting Thomas and the others the marks in his risen body; but it is the Church which will be the offerer, the Church which is the body of which he is the head, the Church which can act as High Priest and continue the one act of the Redemption because of its identity with him. And this identity comes into full operation at Pentecost, when the espousals contracted between Christ and the Church are consummated, and the Holy Ghost who is the bond of love between the Father and the Son, and operative in all divine transactions, appears as the consummation of the union between the lover Christ and his spouse.

And, lastly, it is surely not fanciful to see a very definite intention in the use made by our Lord and the inspired writers of the so-called metaphors of nuptials, and marriage feast or supper to describe the happiness of the soul in enjoyment of God?

To appreciate these images fully, it must be observed that incorporation in Christ is through the flesh of Christ under the appearance of bread, and therefore that this incorporation can fittingly be spoken of in terms of a feast or supper, and concurrently as a marriage bond. It was said above that love means union, and between human beings love finds an end in marriage, since human nature consists of body as well as of soul. Now the Son of God took to himself a human nature and used that as the means of making us sharers in the divine nature. The perfect mode of union, therefore, between God and man, love in its supreme expression, the standard and pattern to be imitated in the hierarchy of creatures, will find its analogy in human love in marriage. No metaphor here, but a secret cousinship, between the perfect and the imperfect, and the imperfect will receive its full explanation and interpretation when God reveals himself, and shows that all creation revolves round Christ and was made in his setting. Therefore, St Paul, speaking of human marriage, does not invert the right order when he startles his readers with the abrupt ending, that a man shall cleave to his wife and shall be two in one flesh, not because of the natural law, but because marriage is a sacrament, the symbol, the institution on a lower plane of

the supreme union between Christ and his Church. And so we may justifiably attribute to the union between Christ and his new members all that is perfect in the reality of marriage and then sublimate it, and see it as the inadequate but admirably suited image of the boundless love of Christ for mankind.

This is what St Paul does: he tells his Ephesians that wives should be subject to their husbands because the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church, where we see that the relation is exact in the supernatural marriage and less so in the human contract. And after more exhortations of a similar kind, he ends with his favourite phrase: " No man hateth his own *flesh* . . . but cherisheth it as also Christ doth the Church, because we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."[1]

The same image is before St Paul when, in writing to the Corinthians, he bids them beware of abusing this body by fornication. " Know you not," he says, " that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid!"[2] Here the meaning clearly is that we who are one body and one spirit with Christ, are united to him in that way

[1] Ephes. v 29, 30. [2] 1 Cor. vi 15.

more intimately than a wife with a husband, so that to be unfaithful to him is to be a harlot. And the more we think of it, the more exact will seem the image. If by the holy Eucharist we are in contact with the flesh of Christ and thereby transformed into the body of Christ which will share with him his beatitude with the Father, while at the same time there is generated in us personally a new life, the fruit of the coming together, we can truly speak of a marriage consummated between Christ and ourselves, a marriage with its nuptial feast and couch. Indeed, we may speak of Baptism as the betrothal, the contract made after the heavy price paid of the Passion, a betrothal which looks forward to the consummation of the marriage as Baptism looks forward to the Eucharist. The one is the leaving of kindred, the giving up of the old life—its death and burial, as we saw above—while the other is the cleaving to Christ, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone in the new life of the Resurrection.

The old pagan world was haunted by the dream of a union with the divine, a dream which is embodied in the legend of Eros and Psyche. The Eucharist is the divine version of the ancient story, and surpasses it in beauty and light as the sun surpasses the fitful starlight in the darkness. For a vision is vouchsafed to us of the family of

God; the Father in love with his Son, and the spouse of the Son who has left " her tribe's black tents for the red pavilion of his heart," and the Holy Ghost the bond of love between the Father and the Son, sanctifying the nuptial rites and accomplishing the desire of the Son " that they all may be one, as thou Father in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."[1] " Filia Patris, sponsa Filii, sacrarium Spiritus Sancti " (Alexander of Hales). St Bernard, transported with joy at the thought of this union, cries out: " No matter what thou art, have confidence and shrink not. In the Spirit of the Son learn thou art the daughter of the Father, the spouse and sister of the Son. No matter what thou art by both titles thou wilt be addressed. And near at hand is the reason why, nor need I seek afar: the voice of the spouse unto her, ' Come into my garden, my sister, my spouse.' Sister in sooth because one Father, spouse because one Spirit. For if carnal marriage make two in one flesh, still more shall this spiritual mating make two in one Spirit."

But better than any human testimony to the truth of the espousal of the soul with Christ is that of the inspired writer: " And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude and as the

[1] John xvii 21.

voice of many waters and as the voice of great thunders, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord our God, the Almighty hath reigned. Let us be glad and rejoice and give glory to him. For the marriage of the Lamb is come and his wife hath prepared herself."[1]

" And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."[2]

NOTE

Using the fourfold classification of causes, most theologians call grace the formal cause of our union with God, and the Holy Spirit the efficient and exemplary cause. This distinction safeguards the position of grace, as defined in the Council of Trent. But certain theologians, feeling that the part assigned to the Holy Ghost does not do justice to a certain expression of St Paul, distinguish between justification and adoption. Of the first, grace is the formal cause; of the latter, the Holy Spirit. This view has been severely handled owing to the difficulty of squaring it with the Tridentine doctrine. In the text I have kept to scriptural images and suggested that the appropriate activity of the Holy Spirit is in the marriage between the soul and Christ through Communion and its effects, and between Christ and his Church (as seen, for instance, at Pentecost), whereas grace is the ring of espousal, the justification, the " election " in St Paul's word of the Christian—which is made actual in the Sacrament of Baptism. And the reason given was that just as the Holy Ghost is the link of love between the

[1] Apoc. xix 6, 7. [2] Apoc. xxi 2.

Father and Son, so, too, in the introduction of human nature into the life of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost will again be the link of love between the Father and the Spouse of his Son, and between the Son the Bridegroom, who is possessed of the Godhead, and the Bride, made one flesh and one spirit with him. What kind of causality this involves I have left undetermined, since I am not writing a theological treatise, and, besides, it is perilous to try to inquire too far into the *profunda Dei.*

On a very different footing is another suggestion, which I have reserved for a note because it may appear to some more fanciful than convincing. Those in the Catholic Church know that a gulf separates them from those who are unhappily not of the fold. They belong to his Mystical Body, while the non-Catholic is in heresy or schism. And yet those non-Catholics who have been baptised have been raised to the supernatural order, and, as it would seem to follow, belong also to the Mystical Body of Christ, granted, of course, that they are in good faith. It is good to think that many, despite their being visibly not in communion with the Church, may by God's mercy share the happiness hereafter of those who have lived the truths of faith in obedience to the Vicar of Christ on earth. Nevertheless, we may well ask the question, with more reason surely than the elder brother of the Prodigal, Is it nothing to have belonged to the household of Christ, to the visible Church ? Does not the actual adherence to Christ's Mystical Body give a special character to his children ? We are anxious to gain converts, not merely because we fear for their salvation (a baptised Anglican clergyman, for example, as we know, may be a model and reproach to ourselves), but because we are profoundly convinced that those in visible union with Christ's Vicar belong to Christ somehow more intimately and more authentically.

It would not be difficult, by enumerating the many advantages, to show the gain in being a visible member of the Church, but a simple and decisive answer might perhaps be given by applying the doctrine given in the text about Baptism and the Eucharist to the two cases. The non-Catholic is, we suppose, baptised, but not belonging to any denomination which has valid orders. He has not, therefore, " eaten of the Flesh," of Christ, and, consequently, he does not belong in the same sense as a Catholic to that Mystical Body which grows by Mass and Communion. If then the incorporation with Christ is, as has been maintained in the text, accomplished and perfected by the Eucharist, the non-Catholic is in quite a different position from the Catholic. Nevertheless, owing to the intimate connection of the Eucharist with baptism, which implies that baptism is the death of the old man and the desire for union with the new Adam, this latter Sacrament does " intentionally " contain the Eucharist, and so affiances the soul to Christ in preparation for the marriage celebration. The non-Catholic is in the position of the betrothed, but the union has never been consummated. And this is the reason why a Catholic should scour sea and land to make one convert, why there is such a joy when a conversion takes place, and why the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, has never had any truck with tendencies minimising the immense difference that separates her members from all other individuals be they baptised and ever so holy.

But now two objections to this solution will immediately suggest themselves. And the first is that children who die before receiving Holy Communion would then be no better off than the non-Catholic, and this is a view intolerable in itself and against all tradition. It is certainly true that tradition is unanimous in giving children who die before receiving Communion equal rank with those who have

" eaten of the flesh " of Christ. And the reason given may at first sight seem to apply also to the non-Catholic in good faith. This reason is, however, not that Baptism by itself signifies and effects incorporation with Christ and that, therefore, Communion is non-essential. If that had been the one given, the solution I have suggested would straightway cease to have any worth, and, indeed, one could run one's pen through much that has been written in the preceding chapter. On the contrary, however, the reason given is a clear confirmation of the view taken, and in essence it is this. Since Baptism looks forward to the Eucharist and contains it *in voto*, since the death and resurrection of Christ and consequently of his brethren and heirs are interwoven together, the end being contained virtually in the means, the baptised child is incorporated with Christ in view of the fulfilment and ratification of that incorporation in Holy Communion. The child is baptised into the Church of Christ, which consists of those who have fed upon his Body and are, therefore, his Mystical Body. The child is, so to say, in the womb of his Mother the Church, and lives by her life. As the child's faith and supernatural life are the Church's faith and supernatural life, so, too, is his incorporation. Hence St Augustine, when dealing with this problem, speaks of infants in Baptism receiving the Body and Blood of our Lord spiritually. But be it observed this incorporation, this, so to speak, premature enjoyment of the fruits of the Eucharist, depends on there being a real link of real desire between the two sacraments, a desire made effective by the Church for those not yet enjoying the use of reason, but to be realised by those who have it in their power to consummate the desire. Now adult non-Catholics are not in the position of children, and the opportunity of realising the votum contained in Baptism being within their reach, they cannot be said to

fulfil the condition, and, consequently, for them the effect of Baptism is not, as with the child, to give them the fruit of the Eucharist. They have been affianced, but never made one flesh, one spirit, with Christ.

A few texts out of many will show the point of view of the Church. Toletus puts it shortly: " Since Baptism is directed towards (*ordinatur*) the Eucharist, in its reception the Eucharist is received *in voto*, virtually; and in this manner it is received by infants." For a proper understanding of St Augustine the context is required, and a knowledge of his special vocabulary; the following quotation is, however, explicit enough: " Most certainly, too, of children is Christ the Saviour; most certainly will they perish if they are not redeemed by him: since they cannot have life without his Flesh and Blood." Albert the Great in one sentence sums up the whole doctrine admirably: " For no reason can be assigned why the Church is called and is the Body of Christ, save in the manner explained, by giving it his Body, and he changes it into himself so that it is made his Body and each one becomes a member of himself." Finally, we have the authority of St Thomas: " As was said above, there is a twofold way of receiving this Sacrament (the Eucharist)—to wit, spiritually and sacramentally. But it is clear that all are bound to eat at least spiritually, for this is to be incorporated in Christ, as was said above. But the spiritual eating includes a votum, a desire of the reception of the Sacrament, as has been said. And so without a votum of receiving this Sacrament there can be no salvation for a man. But the votum *would be in vain unless it were fulfilled when the opportunity arises* " (3 *S.*, 80, 11 c.).

The second objection comes from the fact that the Greek Church possesses valid orders, and consequently can offer the sacrifice of the Mass. All, then, that the Catholic has

by eating the Flesh of Christ is theirs also, since they have the Eucharist. That the objection does not settle the question straightway is evident from the difficulty many of the earlier members of the Church had in admitting the validity, still more the efficacy, of the sacrifice and sacraments of heretics or schismatics. It is the Church, the Body of Christ, which offers the sacrifice; how then can those not in communion with that Body sacrifice? "The victims of the wicked are abominable to the Lord" (Prov. xv 8). "Outside the Catholic Church there is no place for a true sacrifice" (St Prosper, from St Augustine). "Alone in the Catholic Church is the true victim our Redeemer offered" (St Gregory the Great).

How these statements are reconciled with the accepted fact that schismatics can celebrate the Eucharist as long as the intention to do what the Church intends persists, need not detain us. The point is that only the Body of Christ can offer and gain the fruits of the sacrifice and of Communion. And the privilege of the Catholic is beautifully expressed by Optatus: "Christ indicates in the Canticle of Canticles that there is only one who is his dove, his chosen Spouse, his garden enclosed and fountain sealed up; so that all who are heretics have neither the keys which Peter alone received, nor the ring wherewith it is said the fountain is sealed up; nor any of those things which are his to whom the garden belongs in which he plants his little bushes." In which passage Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist are perhaps described under the images. Those then outside the Church are not privileged. They have the sacraments, but, as St Augustine says, "they are like the gifts of a true husband in the hands of a fornicating woman." This image, which need not be further developed, is in striking accord with the distinction made between the Bride of Christ, flesh of his flesh, and those who, not

belonging to the Church, yet dare to consecrate and receive the Body of Christ. As St Thomas says: "Those who are separated from the Church by heresy and schism or excommunication . . . sin in consecrating, and consequently do not receive the fruit of the Sacrament" (3 *S.*, 82, 7).

We may stop here, since this is but a note, and not intended to be more than a suggestion. The question was, What makes the Catholic so much better off than the non-Catholic, who is nevertheless a baptised Christian and presumably in grace ?[1] It is certain that the Catholic is so much more fortunate that he should, and often may, spend a lifetime to make one convert. It is as certain, also, that the difference lies in the presence or absence of visible union with the Vicar of Christ. This difference is essential, it is one of obedience or disobedience to Christ's order, of inheritance or disinheritance. It means, that is, the loss of the privileges of Communion, and, ordinarily, of the visible means of grace instituted by Christ. Such a loss and such a plight may appear to make any further discussion of the subject unnecessary, especially when the uncertainty even of the existence of the supernatural life in many must be admitted.

Nevertheless, it remains true that all properly baptised persons, if they are free from serious sin, possess the supernatural life, and the supernatural life is, to use a metaphor, the very soul of Christianity. The question,

---

[1] I say " presumably in grace," because the alternative that most non-Catholics are in bad faith is odious. Good faith is not, however, the same as being free from serious sin. When it is remembered that serious sin cannot be forgiven without perfect contrition, save in the Sacrament of Penance, one is bound to feel anxious for those who are not of the fold and know not of this Sacrament.

therefore, still remains, Are those Christians who live inculpably outside the visible Church possessed of the supernatural life in the same manner as those in the visible Church? And it is legitimate to search, to see if we can find an answer through a distinction which will fall within this very supernatural life itself. And the clue is the Eucharist, and the suggested distinction is one which both elucidates and carries further the view put forward in the text.

If the Eucharist has that pre-eminence in the Christian life, which I have tried to show, and, on the analogy of marriage, be the completion of Baptism as it was its motive and end, then we should expect that those who do not belong to the visible, authentic Body of Christ, and cannot feed upon his Flesh, should lose thereby something of that very life of Christ which animates his visible Body.

The suggestion seems all the more probable in that it fits in so well with what is acknowledged to be the decisive difference between the Catholic and non-Catholic—namely, visible union with the Vicar of Christ. A recent writer has well said: "The doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has always constituted, more truly than the Papacy, the dividing[1] line between the conservatives in religion and their opponents"; and he shows how the story of the Reformation in England bears out this assertion. But perhaps it would be truer still to say that the Papacy and the Holy Eucharist are felt as one, and usually in history and controversy stand or fall together. The Church is the continuation of Christ, and the members are one in their offering in priestly wise of the Victim in whom they are incorporated; and this membership is most visible in the Vicar of Christ, who is both visible head and High Priest.

[1] Algernon Cecil, *A Dreamer in Christendom*, p. 115.

To refuse visible communion with the Pope is, therefore, to lose the right to participate in the one offering, the Mass, and in its consummation, the feast of unity and incorporation with Christ. The very happiness which converts feel in the unity of fellowship and unity with the head is surely not other than the joy in being one body and one spirit with Christ. They know him in the breaking of the bread.

CHAPTER II

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

WE have tried in the preceding chapter to make clear that the Redemption has a twofold rôle, the remission of sin and the gift of a new life—exhibited in the death of our Lord and his Resurrection, and signified in the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. God had devised a plan whereby the offence against him could be atoned for, and, at the same time, by the very same act through which forgiveness came, the sinner could be elevated into a supernatural union with himself. All things were to be recapitulated in him—he, the natural Son of the Father, the Word, would be made flesh, and suffer the punishment due to sin as the innocent scapegoat—and by him and with him and in him through that crucified body made glorious would the world be given a new life. The Lamb slain is to be the source of life, the perpetual Paschal meal of those baptised into his death and risen with him. Thus the problem which God had set himself reached its solution: "Then Adam tasted death when he first tasted the fruit; and he

tasted life when he tasted of the tree of life through the Cross. He was driven from the tree of life and the Tree of Life came to him. He received the promise of death by tasting the fruit, and the promise of Resurrection by tasting the body and blood " (*Syrus de Adamo*, eleventh century).

Our human nature corrupted by sin was assumed by the Son of God, who could not know sin: the sin was slain in the death of the body of Christ on Calvary, and that body rose incorrupt and glorious to be the food of man, transforming him into its life—the supernatural life of union with the Godhead.

But now, what part has the Mass in the working out of this redemptive plan? The Mass is a sacrifice, the death of Christ was a sacrifice, and the two are somehow one and the same sacrifice; this we know; and the clear teaching of the Council of Trent has given Catholics a mastery over this most profound mystery. " This our God, therefore, and Lord, although he was to offer himself once to God the Father by the intercession of death on the altar of the Cross, that he might thereby accomplish eternal Redemption, nevertheless, because his priesthood was not to be extinguished by death, at the Last Supper, on the night in which he was betrayed, that he might leave a sacrifice visible (as the

nature of man demands) to his beloved Spouse the Church, wherein the bloody sacrifice once and for all enacted on the Cross might be shown forth, its memorial last to the end of time, and its saving power be applied to the forgiveness of those sins we daily commit, declaring that he was constituted a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech, offered to his Father his body and blood under the species of bread and wine, and commissioned his Apostles, whom he ordained priests of the New Testament, and their successors in the priesthood that they should take and make oblation under the same symbols, commanding them in these words: 'This do in memory of me. . . .'"

In this majestic passage the Council, after stating that our Lord gave himself in sacrifice on the altar of the Cross, proceeds then to show the connection of the Mass with that sacrifice. We may well follow the same order.

The death of our Lord on Calvary was a sacrifice—and a propitiatory sacrifice. A sacrifice is the sensible offering of a victim by a priest to God alone in testimony of his being the sovereign Lord of all things. God is our Beginning and End, our Maker and our Good, and so the creature by the act of sacrifice signifies his interior submission to that Maker and surrender to that Good. It is

an external sign of an inward submission because man is made up of body as well as soul, and his official acts should therefore be public and visible —the expression of a state of mind and will. Now sacrifice can take many different shapes—in fact, some kinds would astonish the ordinary man and woman, who are accustomed to associate the word sacrifice in their minds with only one kind, and that a painful and costly sacrifice. This is indeed one kind of sacrifice, the one called propitiatory, and it was and is universal; and, furthermore, it is the one which immediately concerns us, because Calvary was a propitiatory sacrifice. As the name implies, it is the attempt of man to placate an offended God and to give satisfaction—that is, to offer compensation and to pay the penalty. To do this a victim is chosen and put to death—generally in a bloody manner, to signify clearly the destruction of life. The death of the victim symbolises the punishment due to sin—for the wages of sin is death—a punishment inflicted by proxy on some animal, or in a very crude civilisation on some one human being specially chosen out. Since this sacrifice is a sign of adoration as well as of reparation or atonement, it may, of course, be also used as a means of impetration and thanksgiving. Now in this sacrifice there are two constituents which

are often expressed by the one word and often confused, and these two are immolation and oblation. For instance, a lamb is sacrificed to propitiate God; there is the letting of blood—that is, the slaying of the lamb—and secondly, the offering of the victim to God. The two may indeed coalesce in one action, but then that action should manifest in some visible and liturgical way that the immolation is a making over to God of the victim. The reason is obvious, for unless words or circumstances or manner of acting made it clear that the slaying was meant as an offering to God, the action could not be a sacrifice. In the sacrifice of Calvary, for instance, the slaying was performed by the Jews to their own damnation; yet that slaying was a sacrificial act, not on the part of the Jews, but because Christ the High Priest offered his death and became the Victim for the ransom of mankind. Where and when our Lord externally made oblation of himself must be determined later.

The sacrifice on the part of the priest is completed by the immolation and oblation, but there remains the acceptance on the part of God of the sacrifice. Cain's sacrifice, for instance, was not acceptable, whereas that of Abel was, though we do not know how God manifested his acceptance of the one and rejection of the other. On another

occasion we read of God sending down fire to consume the sacrifice as a token of his acceptance, and this may perhaps have happened to the sacrifice of Abel. At any rate, some sign of acceptance is given by God, and the victim from that moment ceases to be in its former state. It belongs to God, and is sacred, and can even serve as a model of communication between God and man. This, no doubt, is the reason behind the practice so often to be observed in the history of sacrifice of the offerers partaking of the victim and so entering into closer relation with the divinity. This sacrificial meal is the consummation of the sacrifice, for it symbolises, at least, the union with God which has been attained by the acceptance on his part of the sacrifice, and, as was stated, the end of sacrifice is a worship which brings us nearer to our God. It should be observed that this banquet is not what constitutes the sacrifice, as though the offering were secondary to the meal or that the meal could be held to be a sacrifice without the preceding oblation. This caution is important as bearing on the Eucharist, for it would be wrong to separate the Eucharist in thought from the Mass or to think that the Mass has no purpose save to bring down our Lord to be our food. That would be to turn upside down the meaning of sacrifice—to put man before

God. A sacrifice is made to God. It is God's bounty which makes the sacrifice turn to our benefit.[1]

Nevertheless, this meal may in a sense be said to be the consummation of the sacrifice, for the sacrifice which man offers in lowliness of heart in worship and in the desire that he may attain closer to God, his End, is in the very acceptance by God made salutary, and God so disposes of the gift, now his, that it becomes the means whereby man does draw closer to his end by sitting at table with God and enjoying his good things. This habit of feasting on the victim so often to be observed in pagan sacrifices would

[1] This statement is in keeping with the view put forth in the first chapter—that God's object in the Redemption was to restore us to the supernatural order, and that this was accomplished by the union of the sacred humanity of Christ with us in the Eucharist. As was shown, the Redemption had a twofold end—propitiatory and unitive. This twofold end was effected by one act, a sacrifice which has as its fruit *Union*. Our Lord's sacrifice was the supreme act of worship and reparation to the Father. From the Father comes the fruit—for in accepting the sacrifice he exalted Christ, and gave him a new title—that of the Glorious Victim—that we might participate in the sacrifice and enjoy the life-giving Food of that sacrifice. Hence the Eucharist is always a sacrifice—*through* Christ the Victim, *with* him the Glorified Victims, and *in* him the Life of the soul.

have remained dark and mysterious had not the sacrifice of Christ shown how God had ordained and promoted this custom—as an adumbration of the institution of the Last Supper.

To sum up, a propitiatory sacrifice consists of a visible public act—that is, a liturgical act—and that act has two constituents—a formal offering of a victim and a slaying or immolation of that victim. The sacrifice is made to God, and God in return may show by some sign that he accepts it.

After this short account of the nature of sacrifice, the sacrificial character of our Lord's Passion and death will be plain. He offered himself as a Victim to be slain for the sins of the world. The Paschal sacrifice of the Jews is the prefiguring of the Lamb of God, " for Christ, being come an High Priest of the good things to come, by his own blood, entered once into the Holy of Holies, having obtained eternal Redemption."[1] The slaying is done by the Jews, but the High Priest is Christ and the Victim is Christ. We know that he offered himself up, for he foretold the offering; and the tragic yet sublime beauty of the story of the Passion lies in the self-oblation of him " who was offered because it was his own will, and he opened not his mouth."[2] Plainly

[1] Heb. ix 11. [2] Isa. liii 7.

written, too, is the acceptance of this sacrifice by the Father, in the glorious Resurrection of the "crucified Jesus," and the Ascension to the right hand of God.

All this is plain sailing so far: the Redemption was by sacrifice, the Gospels record that sacrifice, and in the history of that sacrifice Christ offered himself as a Victim and was immolated. But now the difficulties arise, and the main difficulty is the interconnection of the Last Supper and Calvary. With Calvary we are apt to associate instinctively the sacrifice of our Redemption, the reason, no doubt, being the Cross and the death of our Lord upon it. In other words, the immolation took place there. In pursuance of this train of thought, we may think also of the Last Supper as a sacrifice in some way connected with Calvary, but in other respects separate from it. And here an additional reason might be that the Mass we know to be a sacrifice and the Liturgy of the Mass is derived from the Last Supper. Nevertheless, second thoughts might well make us doubt these too ready impressions. First of all, it is certain that the Mass is derived from Calvary. Again, if we turn to Calvary, we find, indeed, a visible and real immolation, but we cannot straightway find there any formal oblation. The oblation in the Mass, on the other hand, is

clearly taken from the Last Supper. Furthermore, if the first impression be argued out, and the Last Supper is taken as a sacrifice as well as the Crucifixion, then there would seem to follow this awkward conclusion that Calvary was somehow or other anticipated, that the Redemption was accomplished the night before the Passion, and secondly, that our Lord suffered death then, and by his own hand.

Now it must be admitted that despite these apparent conclusions, many Catholic writers have accepted the view that the Last Supper and Calvary, however intimately connected, are nevertheless separate to this extent, that each contains within itself all the constituents of a sacrifice. Their attempts to surmount the difficulties will be considered in a later chapter. For the moment, let us examine possible alternatives. Two are immediately forthcoming. They are, first, that the Last Supper was not a sacrifice at all; second, that the Last Supper and Calvary make one identical sacrifice, in which the oblation is formally made at the Supper while the real immolation takes place on Calvary. The first alternative is ruled out because it is utterly inconsistent with Scripture and tradition; the second is the view accepted in these pages, and it gives an easy solution to the problems just stated, for it shows

how the Mass is bound up both with Calvary and the Last Supper, and explains how the Last Supper is a sacrifice not anticipating that of Calvary, but identical with it.[1]

We must now turn to the arguments favouring, if not compelling, this view. And the first point to notice is the change that takes place in our Lord from the time when the Supper is begun. Whereas he had hastened to the cenacle as to a feast—"With desire have I desired to eat this Pasch with you"[2]—as the evening passes this desire passes into a sadness, which is not explained entirely by the knowledge that he is bidding his friends farewell before his Passion. He is weighed down by an awful sense of responsibility; his words become more solemn, his actions more and more deliberate; and finally, the change is full circle when in the Garden he cries: "Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from me, nevertheless not as I will, but as thou

[1] The view to be proposed in the text is that of Père de la Taille. The proofs and the evidence for it can be found in their abundance in the pages of *Mysterium Fidei*. These are omitted in the text because the nature of the work is not primarily controversial, and it is hoped that the very simplicity of the view, together with its attractiveness and intrinsic cogency, may disclose the divine handiwork in its designing.

[2] Lc. xxii 15.

wilt "[1]—a cry as of a Victim dedicated, no longer free to choose, but bound by an oblation self-made to death. It is as though the Passion had begun, and the choice inevitably made, and the execution about to begin. And this change all four Gospels attest, for they fix on one incident—that of the betrayal, the departure of Judas—as the beginning of the Passion which they are about to narrate. And with her unerring instinct, it is the same incident which the Church has fastened on in her Liturgy, for, as we know, in the drama of Holy Week the prologue of the tragedy is the treachery of Judas.

And if the change in our Lord's attitude and the process of events seem to reveal him as a Victim, the words he uses in his discourse, quite apart from the words of Institution, seem to reveal him in the character of High Priest. They are, as has been often recognised, sacrificial words, solemn as befits speech which is official and liturgical: "For them do I sanctify myself,"[2] on which words St Chrysostom writes: "What means 'I sanctify myself'? I offer thee sacrifice. For that it was his sacrifice is suggested by the word sanctify, and made evident by what follows" (*In Jo. xiii* 19). And St Cyril of Alexandria explains the same words by the

[1] Matt. xxvi 39. [2] John xvii 19.

synonyms "offer" and "dedicate." The words, therefore, and the conduct of our Lord lead us to think of him as Priest and Victim—a Priest making oblation of himself as the Victim of the Passion.

This impression is deepened by the circumstances of the Institution and the material he makes use of. On a former occasion he had said: "The bread that I will give you is my flesh for the life of the world."[1] And now it is that he gives his Apostles that bread, which is his body, and it would seem, therefore, to follow that therewith he is offering it for the life of the world, as Priest and Victim. This bread, we know besides, takes us back to the sacrifice of Melchisedech, the King of Salem, who brought forth the "bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God."[2] Now our Lord was, as St Paul tells us in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "a priest according to the order of Melchisedech," who, "in offering himself," "might be a propitiation for the sins of the people." And not only is the prefiguring sacrifice of Melchisedech fulfilled in this sacrifice of Christ, but also the sterner sacrifice of the Jews. As we read in the Book of Exodus, Moses ratified the Old Covenant by taking the blood of the victims and sprinkling it upon the people,

[1] John vi 52. [2] Gen. xiv 18.

with the words: " This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."[1] The parallel between these words and those of our Lord, " This is the blood of the New Testament," is so close as to put the sacrificial character of our Lord's offering beyond all doubt. And if the obvious connection of the Jewish Pasch with the sacrifice begun at the Last Supper be added to the already accumulated proofs, does it not become so clear as to be beyond dispute that our Lord was, as High Priest, offering himself as the Lamb of God to take away the sins of the world by death?

The Gospels record that our Lord, taking the bread and wine, blessed them, and after the breaking of the bread said, " This is my body," and after giving thanks, gave them the cup, saying, " This is my blood, the blood of the New Testament, shed for you for the remission of sins." The bread and wine are the symbols, and they are separated to represent an immolation which is to come. Behind the symbols are the real Body and blood of Christ; the immolation, then, is symbolised and the offering is real—a symbol and a reality. Under the symbols are the true body and blood; that body and blood are to suffer in sacrifice on the Cross on the morrow. They

[1] Exod. xxiv 8.

are now present when the High Priest, taking them, represents by a symbolic action that future suffering unto death, and in that action consecrates a victim to be slain. That the action could mean a real slaying is impossible, for Christ, the Victim as well as the Priest, could not slay himself; and the action, purposely symbolical or representative, is concerned with the bread and wine. But as that bread and wine are really other than what they appear to be, the action symbolises what the words of the priest declare—to wit, that this body and this blood are to be shed in sacrifice for the world. There is, then, a present oblation of a future death, and as that death took place at the close of the Passion, we can see the sacrificial nature of the Supper and of Calvary and the identity that exists between them. In other words, the Passion of our Lord begins, as the Gospels and Church agree in holding, with the betrayal of Judas and ends with the giving up of the ghost by Christ. It is one drawn-out single act and operation—the one sacrifice—with its two phases clearly marked, the *Transitus Domini* beginning with the solemn liturgy of the Last Supper, where the High Priest offers himself a Victim to be slain. Then the scene changes, but the oblation persists. He is led like a lamb to the slaughter, and on the altar of the Cross the

blood of the Victim is poured out for the ransom of many.

That the long course of the Passion should unfold but one act, that the oblation of the evening should last and make the rôle of Christ in the courts of Pilate and Herod, on the way of the Cross, and on Calvary, that of Victim, is made intelligible by the fact that Christ was both High Priest and Victim. Time is of little moment to a divine agent, especially when the oblation persists in the identity between the victim and the offerer. Hence it is that the Council of Trent speaks of the offering of himself by Christ on the altar of the Cross, because the Passion from the Supper to the Cross is one act of sacrifice, and the oblation made at the outset perseveres to the end and is seen in all its grim realisation on the altar of the Cross. With true instinct, indeed, Christians have marked Calvary as the holy place of sacrifice, and represented the Redemption by the symbol of the Cross, for without a doubt the carrying into effect of a resolution or a vow or a self-oblation is the sealing of it—the full, unalterable expression, even though it be one and the same act, morally considered.

To sum up, then, in the sacrifice of Christ the High Priest and the Victim are one, and this explains why the two essential parts of a sacrifice,

oblation and immolation—that is, the outward and liturgical oblation and the real immolation—are separated by time and yet one single extended act. Our Lord offers himself to be immolated at the Last Supper in a ritual act which represents symbolically the slaying, but entails a real offering. On Calvary there is a real slaying, and the oblation made before persists to the end, thus making the death on the Cross the completion of a true sacrifice.

The main features now of the sacrifice of Christ should be clear, but there still remains one important incident which has so far not been adequately explained, and that is, the symbolic immolation at the Last Supper by the separate consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. Why this prelude to the Passion, why the use of bread and wine, and in what way is the command that this rite should be repeated by the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood connected with the one sacrifice of our Redemption? A short and definite answer is to take our Lord's own words in explanation, "Do this in commemoration of me." The priesthood appointed by Christ, the ministers of his Church, were to announce the death of the Lord till he came again. In the same way, therefore, as Christ had offered up his Passion by the

symbolic action of the separate consecration of what was truly his own body and blood, so, too, after the Passion, the Church was to offer up the same Passion by having the true body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and wine which, by their separate consecration, would again represent symbolically the immolation of Christ. The identity between the two rites is evident, but at the same time there is a difference, for in the rite of the Last Supper the real body and blood of Christ were offered to be immolated, whereas the Church in consecrating has the real body and blood not dedicated to a future death because the Passion is finished. The Church's oblation, therefore, is of the Passion, and does not record the future, but the past. The Christ who has suffered is upon the altar. But to show the importance of this difference, and, in developing it, to give a fuller answer to the questions already raised, requires a new chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

TO grasp the full meaning of the Mass and its likeness to and contrast with the rite enacted by Christ at the Last Supper, the significance of the Resurrection must be borne in mind, and also the object which led the Son of God to become man. Some repetition, therefore, is required. The object of the Son of God was, as has been stated, to restore man to the supernatural life of union with the Trinity, and to gain this end he made propitiation for sin, and by the same act won as prize from his Father the glorious state of Victim and the union of mankind with himself through his flesh. It is noteworthy that the sublime prayer of petition and thanksgiving, in which the Father is asked that Christ's chosen ones may be in him as he is in the Father, comes just before or after the Institution of the Eucharist. Now this end so desired by our Lord and confidently promised by him, is, as has also been stated, gained by the reward for his propitiatory sacrifice—namely, the Resurrection. Acceptance, as we have seen, is the extrinsic

complement of sacrifice, God making known often by some visible sign that the sacrifice is acceptable in his sight; and to such an extent does God's benevolence stretch that the Victim, which has become his property and gracious in every sense of the word, is permitted to be the sign and means of the new alliance between the creature and the Creator, the creature acquiring grace and sacrosanct prerogatives by partaking, after the sacrifice, of the victim as at a divine banquet. With regard to the sacrifice of Calvary, then, the Resurrection to life of the dead body of Christ is the sign of the Father's acceptance; the Victim slain is endowed with a special title of holiness, and it is proposed to man that he should partake of that body which has redeemed him, and so pass into that special kinship with the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, already indirectly signified at Baptism.

We can consider, then, for convenience' sake, the effect of this acceptance, in respect to Christ and in respect to redeemed mankind. Christ the Son of God had a human nature which, despite the hypostatic union with the Word, was in everything save sin like to ours. The presence of divinity did not make itself felt normally in any external visible manifestation, although, as we can gather from the Transfiguration, it was

connatural to that human nature to be irradiated with the divine beauty and to be immortal and glorious. That human nature had a task to perform, and the suitableness of the condition it wore, is seen in the *Ecce Homo* of the Passion. Only after the sacrifice did that body "put on incorruption,"[1] when the latent divinity raised it from the tomb and shone through its texture. By an appropriation warranted by the words of Christ himself and St Peter at Pentecost and St Paul in his epistles, this Resurrection is attributed to the Father, to whom the sacrifice was offered, in whose power lay the acceptance or refusal. "Therefore God hath exalted him and given him a name which is above every name."[2] Correctly, therefore, the glory which belongs to the risen Christ is said to be the reward of the Father. That glory brings with it immortality and impassibility—that is, Christ can suffer no more, he can give but not lose, he can make others like to himself, but no longer can he endure the result of sin and obloquy. Nevertheless, the past is not wiped out; the memory of the self-sacrifice and love strong as death is not effaced; the glory that is his has a particular connection with the act which entitled him to it; in fact, that glory is just that title, that "new name" which

[1] 1 Cor. xv 53. [2] Phil. ii 9.

makes of his shame an honour, and of his sacrifice a means of interceding for ever for the brethren on whose behalf he died. And this new name is that of Glorious Victim. By it he is the Lord of a new race bound to him for ever by the testament of blood, to be united still more closely by eating of that body and blood of the Redemption. Connatural is it to Christ to possess a glorified human nature, but only by the redemptive sacrifice could he win from the Father the new prerogative in which he could eternally rejoice—the prerogative of Victim, of Saviour. And this prerogative it is which is his for ever, given over to him as the firstfruits of the Redemption, the spoil of the Cross, which makes that Cross the symbol of triumph and the emblem of Christ. For this reason he is depicted by St John in the Apocalypse as the Lamb slain but living; for this reason, too, does the risen Lord bear on his body the everlasting marks in his hands and feet and side, and make it known that at the Last Day the Son of man will appear with his Cross to judge the living and the dead. Glorified Victim! It is these two words that sum up the Redemption, and explain the sacrifice of the Mass and the revivifying power of the flesh of Christ when communicated to the faithful.

For us, the Resurrection means life with Christ.

What has been said of him is true in a subordinate sense of us. There are, however, two big differences—the first, that our risen life is, so to speak, the complement of his, what St Paul meant by the increase, and dependent entirely on him as the branches on the vine. The second is that we are not decorated in the court of heaven with that glory (which is our promise sown in us by grace and the Eucharist) until we have on our part merited it by the trial of faith, that faith which is the substance of things hoped for. The real agony and death Christ bore, which we symbolically and in his person underwent, whereas the reward can be said to be really ours rather than his, inasmuch as he was stainless and the natural Son of God. But we could hardly be said to share in his glory, or belong to him, were we not to understudy him in some way in his Redemption. We could hardly be admitted to his Mystical Body if we bore no trace ourselves of victimhood, "filling up those things that are wanting in the sufferings of Christ,"[1] carrying the Cross in some fashion to Calvary. Hence it is that each Christian soul as it advances in the spiritual life puts off the "old man" more and more, and dies to itself in a mystical death, that Christ triumphant may live in it. And similarly

[1] Col. i 24.

the Church and the faithful enjoy the feast of the Lamb, the foretaste of the heavenly feast, by participating, after sacrifice, of the Glorious Victim. In that sacrifice the Church appropriates to itself the Victim of Calvary, and makes its own that divine offering to God, surrendering itself to God, making the all-holy words of self-oblation uttered by the High Priest at the Last Supper resound through the ages in one ever-swelling chord of praise and honour and sacrifice, until the Mystical Body of Christian folk has reached its completeness, and Christ is all in all at the end of time.

To return now to the explanation of the Last Supper as the inauguration of the Mass, and the questions involved in the rite followed by our Lord. It has been shown that at the Last Supper our Lord made, as High Priest, that oblation of himself as Victim which was a necessary part of the sacrifice completed by the immolation on Calvary. While making that oblation he made a symbolic representation of the future real immolation by the separate consecration of the bread and wine into his body and his blood to be shed for the remission of sins; and His Apostles were ordained to perform the same rite in memory of him. In obedience to his command, the Church has from the beginning of her history reproduced

this rite in the Mass. But now between this rite of the Last Supper and that of the Mass there are certain differences, despite the identity; the first being that the Last Supper offering looked to a Victim-to-be, whereas the Mass looks backward to a past Victim, or, as that is really incorrect, to a past act of immolation on Calvary. The second is, that instead of Christ himself being the visible High Priest, the Church, through its priesthood in his name and with his words, even to the keeping of the first person, makes the oblation in the words of consecration. The interconnection, then, of the sacrifice of Calvary which began at the Last Supper, and that of the Mass instituted at the same time, may be shortly summarised as follows. There is identity of Victim and difference in the offerer. Moreover, the Mass is a sacrifice and yet no new sacrifice to be added to that of Christ, for it borrows its reality and efficacy from Calvary and has no meaning apart from it.[1]

[1] The manner after which Christ is the offerer in the Mass will, I hope, by now be apparent. The whole of this book may be said to be an explanation of the relation of Christ's priesthood to our priesthood. Nevertheless, for the sake of convenience and clarity a short summary may be added here. According to the theory defended in the text every Mass is, in one sense, a new sacrifice, but this quality of " new " does not come from a new real

Now the question may well be asked, How can a sacrifice be so intimately associated with a former one as to be essentially and perfectly a sacrifice and yet not new? Is there not, then, some subterfuge here, a subterfuge invented purposely so as to preserve the Mass, and yet at the same time keep the supereminent and sufficing one great sacrifice of Calvary? Moreover, the Epistle to the Hebrews is at pains to make clear

---

immolation, but from a " new " offering of a perennial victim. This " new " offering is made by the Church. I say " new," but here further qualifications are necessary. The Church does not make a " new " offering in the sense that it can make an offering independent of that of Christ. Not only is the Victim the same, but the Church is Christ continuing in his Mystical Body. All the virtue of that Body comes from Christ, its Head. Christ, therefore, can be said to be the principal offerer in the Mass, in that the members are offering by virtue of the Head; and the priesthood of the Church is, so to speak, enveloped by, or a participation of, the priesthood of Christ. The priest, then, offers by virtue of Christ; he consecrates, as St Paschasius says, in *sacerdotio ipso Christi*. " The part which Christ's offering has, is that of the principal and universal cause in its own order; our part is that of a subordinate and particular cause. And so Christ offers through our offering without himself making any new offering in his own person. From the Church comes all that is new; from Christ, all the virtue and power " (*Mysterium Fidei*, p. 296). It will be clear, then, in what sense the Mass is said not to be a " new " sacrifice in the text.

that Christ died but once: " He entered once into the Holy of Holies, having obtained eternal Redemption."[1] To say, then, that the Mass is a sacrifice is to forswear a central dogma of the Christian faith and to make Christ die again.

This is the sharp point of the reformers' objection against the Catholic doctrine, and, as we shall see later, it led to new activity among Catholic theologians to parry the thrust. Not that for one moment was there a doubt about the sacrificial nature of the Mass. That truth was imbedded as deep in the Christian faith as the truth enunciated by St Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the reformers were rightly impugned for perverting an issue, for changing a problem of reconciliation between two certain facts into a denial of one fact by reason of the other.[2]

[1] Heb. ix 12.

[2] One may maintain rightly, I think, against all those who attack the Mass on the ground that it denies the oneness of Christ's redemptive sacrifice, that the objection shows a radical misconception of Christianity, while the answer helps to make the essential nature of that religion clearer. Suppose a man argued that contrary powers could not issue from the same source, and that, therefore, the soul of a man could not be one because reason, say, and feeling fought against each other—the answer would be simply that the critic was confusing material and spiritual unities. It is the very nature of the human soul to possess such powers. Similarly with Christianity—the answer

How, then, make this reconciliation? Let us begin with the question of sacrifice. That the Mass is a sacrificial act is clear, for all the requisites are present—Priest, Victim, and oblation in a visible rite. But now straightway the question arises, How is a victim present? There is no act of immolation, no new blood-letting. As the Council of Trent asserts, the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice. The answer is shown to us in the Last Supper. There our Lord, by means of the bread and wine, represented the immolation to come. Behind the appearances were his true body and blood, so that the Passion was represented symbolically by the separate consecration and the Victim really offered. Similarly, in the separate consecrations at Mass there is a symbolical immolation which serves as a visible liturgical action necessary for a true sacrifice. But that action is only symbolical or mystical; no new *real* victimising of the flesh and blood of Christ takes place, bloody or unbloody. And the reason is simple; if the body and blood of Christ

---

would be that the unity which exists in the Church between the Head and the members is precisely such as to allow one sacrifice to be distributed as it were among the members, and the critic who has not realised this, be he Rationalist or Protestant, has still to learn what is the nature of Christ's Redemption.

are there present on the altar, they are there in a glorious state, *and in a Victim state*. The Victim being present, the rite representing a victim, the Victim being offered, all the requisites for a sacrifice are there.

Recollect what was said about the new title which our Lord acquired in his Resurrection. His body rose glorious and beautiful, but that was not all. It was fitting that the human nature of Christ should be transfigured and become a fit vesture for the divinity abiding in it. This glory was in a sense its natural due, and withheld only because it was to be an instrument of the Redemption. But that its glory should be the crown of the past, that the record of the sacrifice which saved man should be an everlasting testimony and testament imprinted in that risen body—this was the gift of the Father to the Son of man, and through him to his brethren. Christ our Lord is not only glorified, but he is the glorified Victim, and this new status acquired by him is his prerogative for ever, and the sealing of the New Covenant made between God and the human race. Therefore, when the Church celebrates in joy and thanksgiving the memory of Calvary, it is more than a memory, because the same Victim by the words of Consecration is upon the altar, and the rite is more than a memory because it

continues Calvary through time. There is no need for a new real act of immolation, for a new victimising, because the Victim of Calvary is there in his triumph, and that there should be sacrifice, Christ should offer up that same Victim which their High Priest offered at the Last Supper in the visible mode ordained by him.

Visible rite, victim and oblation, the first two now are clear. It remains to say some words on the oblation. Whereas Christ offered himself at the Last Supper, now the Church, through the ministry of her priests, offers the same Victim. This privilege of the Church implies some mysterious identity between her and our Lord, and the identity is expressed in her title of the Mystical Body of Christ. The same truth we have so often had occasion to bring forward before is again the clue, a truth so pregnant with meaning that to pass it over as a luxury of our faith or to misconceive it as non-Catholics unfortunately do, is to miss the core of Christ's thought and intention in redeeming us and instituting the Christian religion.

In dying on the Cross our Lord was the representative of man making atonement for sin against God. As he bore our sins, so his reward is ours; as we went with him on the way of the Cross to a mystical death of pain and a real death to sin, so

we rose with him really redeemed and mystically incorporated into his life. In the Epistle to the Ephesians St Paul tells them that he is praying that they may come to know " the hope of God's calling and the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us who believe: according to the operation of the might of his power, which he wrought in Christ, raising him up from the dead and setting him on his right hand in the heavenly places, above all principality and power, and virtue and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. And he hath subjected all things under his feet and hath made him head over all the Church, which is his body and the fulness of him who is filled all in all."[1]

This Mystical Body, the Church, is, then, by its very name so one with Christ that it can offer the same Victim without multiplying the sacrifice. He is the Head and we are the members, and this Mystical Body grows until Christ reaches that plenitude at the end of the ages. St Paul says that once he knew Christ according to the flesh, but knew him so no longer, for the old things had passed away. The Jesus whom the Apostles had known and touched before the Resurrection

[1] Eph. i 18-23.

did not stay amongst them during the forty days succeeding it, and at his appearances he was somehow different, so that it needed the eyes of faith to see him. It behoved him to go away, for otherwise the Holy Spirit would not come, the Holy Spirit that was to wed the risen Victim with those whose life was to be in him, with the Church, his spouse. After Pentecost the risen Christ lives still amongst us, but invisibly in that visible body which is his, the Church, and in that source of life and union, the Eucharist, where he is disguised under the appearances of bread and wine. The Church, therefore, may be called the extension of Christ, the continuation of Christ, the Victim and Saviour, through time, visible as he was, holy as he is, and one in a sacred seamless union which must not be torn. And the Eucharist is the life of that body, the mode of incorporation or the marriage feast, where Christ and his spouse are made one flesh and one spirit.

It is in keeping, therefore, with God's plan that the Eucharist should have been instituted under the appearance of bread and wine. The risen Jesus was to be disguised, to be represented and made visible by those to whom he gave life. They had been the object of his love, they now were to play the part of Christ, to realise in themselves his love, to come to see for themselves the

union that was theirs with him and with one another. And this requires faith and hope and charity, the response and the acceptance of the inheritance. Jesus Christ is, as it were, passive, having done his part, having paid the price of sin and made the way to union easy through his flesh and blood. He is therefore passive—passive as a Victim which his people can actively offer. He stands at the door of the soul, but does not enter if the bride has fallen asleep or will not open for him; his grace is there anticipating, collaborating, perfecting, but it requires collaboration. The saving of souls, the well-being of the Church his spouse, are made dependent on the charity of the members—in fine, though redeemed, we are left with our free will to accept that Redemption or not. Our Lord is a risen Victim, and therefore we are risen with him, and our life is lived in the promise of full realisation in heaven, but it is by faith. Our Lord is a Victim, but the servant is not greater than his Master, and consequently we have to go to the Mass and ourselves offer the Victim, joining our own body and soul with him as a gift to God, and receiving in return the supernatural union with the Son of God. Through the emptying of ourselves, the pouring out of our gift, we pass to the plenitude of Christ.

That is one reason why the body and blood are hidden under the appearance of bread and wine. But if it be asked why bread and wine instead of any other forms, then the reply might be that bread and wine were offered in sacrifice by Melchisedech, according to whose order of priesthood was Christ. But as it was the offering of Christ which determined that of Melchisedech, the reality being the exemplar of the prophetic type, a simpler and better answer lies in the aptitude of bread and wine to signify the purpose of our Lord's choice. Bread and wine are the forms of food and drink which in all ages and in nearly every land have been the readiest and most common diet of mankind. So true is this that over-hasty anthropologists have traced the divinities of various lands to the aboriginal tendency to create gods out of these necessaries of life, as a Ceres from corn and a Dionysus from the grape. Our Lord, then, who intended that his own body and blood should be the food and sustenance of our supernatural life, naturally chose what in a lower order were the equivalents. And this equivalence and analogy give us further insight into the purposes of Christ. The Victim is to be our food, the body that was to be the means of our Redemption was to be the means, too, of our incorporation with the risen life, the reward of

the Redemption. And so in the sacrifice of the Mass there comes a new note, a note of joy and exultation and thanksgiving, for the sacrifice is now pre-eminently eucharistic. "Amen, amen, I say to you that you shall lament and weep, but the world shall rejoice; and you shall be made sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy. A woman when she is in labour hath sorrow because her hour is come; but when she hath brought forth the child she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world. So also you now indeed have sorrow; but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man shall take from you."[1] The sacrifice begun at the Last Supper and continued through the Passion to its bloody end on the Cross was the travail of Christ that he might bring forth a new creature. And that these new creatures might enjoy the fruits of that Passion and see him again and be in him and he in them, he instituted a rite under the symbols of food in which that body and blood of his, a Victim yet glorious and a principle of new life, might be the means of a joyous sacrifice offered by those incorporated with him, and be the very means of incorporation into the superabounding divine life of peace and union with himself.

[1] John xvi 20-22.

This intricate and divinely contrived plan of God, whereof the Incarnation, death of Christ and Resurrection, and Eucharist of the Church are the mysterious parts, is described in a way which recalls all that has been so far set forth by an unknown writer once thought to be St Augustine in a sermon on the Nativity. "For to-day he cometh forth from the holy Thalamus—that is, from the secret and uncontaminated hiding-place of the Blessed Virgin's womb. He cometh forth thence, the Son of a Virgin, the Spouse of a Virgin; the Son that is of Mary, the Spouse of the Church. For it was to the universal Church that the Apostle spoke when he said, 'I have mated you to one man to show yourself a chaste virgin to Christ.' It is to these nuptials of Christ that the peoples of all races are invited; it is they who have filled the Church, they who have received from the Lord's table no mean feast, no ignoble drink; but they have tasted in anticipation the flesh and blood of the slain Christ himself. He, the innocent Lamb, was slain for his own marriage feast. He was slain for the nuptial feast, and whomsoever he hath invited he has fed on his own flesh. By dying he hath prepared the feast. In rising [from the dead] he hath celebrated the nuptials. By dying he endured the sufferings of his own free will. By

rising he taketh the hand of the bride made ready. In the womb of a Virgin he took on human flesh as a pledge; on the Cross he shed his blood, a dowry beyond price! In his Resurrection and Ascension he hath sealed the troth of an everlasting marriage" (*Inter opera S Aug.*, *Sermo* 372, c. 2, *P.L.*, xxxix, 1662).

CHAPTER IV

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS (*continued*)

IT is now time to gather up the various threads in the mystery of the Redemption and point out one or two conclusions. The sacrifice of Calvary is an act begun at the Last Supper and ending with the death of Christ on Calvary, an offering of himself-to-be-slain in a rite, and the long-sustained suffering which was closed by the slaying of the Victim after three hours upon the Cross. That sacrifice is accepted by the Father, and in token of it the Victim is raised from the dead, clothed with honour, and made to sit at the right hand of God, the Lord of Glory and of a new race, a Figure in perpetual intercession for those bought with a great price. The key to this sacrifice is the identity of Priest and Victim, the offerer with the offered, because owing to that identity the oblation once made persists and constitutes one moral action of a number of acts extending over many hours. Furthermore, that identity explains how it is that the Mass derives all its efficacy from the one sacrifice of the Redemption and yet can

continue through subordinate oblations as long as time shall last. There is one Victim for ever, but because of the union signified at the Resurrection and sealed by the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, Christians can offer in the present without making a new sacrifice.

The key, on the other hand, to the sacrifice of the Mass is the new status of Christ risen from the dead—namely, that of Glorious Victim. These two words are the alpha and omega of the New Testament, the two panels of the diptych of the Redemption. Christ as High Priest offered himself once as Victim; we can, so to speak, take the same Victim in our hands and offer up a gift of infinite value to God; we are admitted to the privilege of making a supreme act of worship. Again, as that Victim was the propitiation for sin, we, too, can offer up the same Victim of infinite value as a propitiatory offering in atonement and as satisfaction for our own sins and the sins of the world, and demand with an assurance warranted by the worth of an offering benefits for ourselves and others and greater love and union from the Father of the Victim. Lastly, our offering can and should be one of exultation and thanksgiving, a memorial of the love strong as death of God for us, and a bridal song of joy at the celebration of the marriage feast of the Son

with his spouse the Church and our own selves. The Mass is, indeed, pre-eminently eucharistic, what Léon Bloy described as "an agony of holocaust accompanied by nuptial songs." St Augustine I think it was who points out that whereas the first consecration was in the evening, the night on which he was betrayed, the Mass is a sacrifice of the dawn, and has in it the joy and ecstasy at the rising of the sun, that Day Star that knows no setting. "Maturatae Resurrectionis laetabunda solemnia." And as we know from tradition that the early Church looked upon the Mass and spoke of it in terms of thanksgiving and praise, it is not far-fetched to read into the words of St Paul, in the very epistle in which the singleness of the sacrifice of the Redemption is so thoroughly emphasised, a reference to the Mass: "By him therefore let us offer up the sacrifice of praise always to God—that is, the fruit of lips confessing to his Name."[1]

[1] The words "fruit of lips confessing" are at first sight disconcerting, but they refer probably to the Septuagint reading in Osee xiv 3, ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν, "We will make offering of the fruit of our lips." The "good news" of the Mass seems also indicated in the Epistle to the Romans xv 15-16: "That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ among the Gentiles, sanctifying the gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be made acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Ghost."

And again, is there not a more than fortuitous consonance between the expression used, say, by Pliny, in describing the morning meetings and prayers of the Christians, and the *sacrificium laudis* of the Mass, "qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis tibique reddunt vota sua"? If we keep in mind that to the early Christians the Mass was pre-eminently a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving prepared not with a knife or any real physical immolation, but by the all-holy words of Consecration, we may be enabled to read the secret of many mysterious expressions to be found in the early literature of the Christian Church.

And now the reason why the Mass in distinction from the Last Supper is a joyous sacrifice is contained in the first epithet given to Christ the Victim. He is a perennial Victim, therefore a sacrifice; he is a glorious Victim, therefore a joyous sacrifice. The Church is the bride bought with a great price and introduced into the divine

---

The Greek word for "sanctifying" the good news is *ἱερουργοῦντα*, and that for oblation and sanctifying, *προσφορά* and *ἡγιασμένη*. In Père de la Taille's commentary on the passage (pp. 197-199), the words of St Paul are shown to be closely connected with the sacrifice of our Lord as Victim. The words themselves are stronger in the Greek than in the translation *ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*.

household. She has left the valley of the shadow of sin to dwell in faith in the paradise, which the Bridegroom on the Cross of pain saw awaiting Dismas, the good thief, and himself, as the reward for this sacrifice. Dead to sin, she has risen with Christ and is incorporated in him. Consequently the Mass is the memorial of a sacrifice which has conquered death. It is the representation of the redemptive act, and a taste or foretaste by faith of its result. It is the act of the Mystical Body, of which Christ is the Head, and at the same time the very process of incorporation. The Head at the Last Supper consecrated his body to be slain on the morrow. The members consecrate daily the same body that was slain. The difference between past and future is the difference between sorrow and joy, between the travail to be undergone and the joy that a new child is born into the world. The Victim the Church offers is a glorious Victim, and the Church which offers is the *plebs sancta*, the people who have seen a great light and have been illumined by that light. To them it is given to celebrate in their turn the sacrifice which was for their salvation, in order that they may appropriate what is theirs by their own act, that they may play the part which really belongs to them, of being as gods, of participating in the divine drama of the Redemp-

tion, and so putting on divinity. They can worship, satisfy, and demand as neither Abel nor Abraham nor Melchisedech were ever able to worship or demand, and the wonder and glory of the sacrifice is that they can in this way appropriate the sacrifice and make it separately and individually a means to merit and approach God, and yet rely on its divine properties as being the sacrifice of the Son of God. More than that, they can give thanks to God the Father that they are one with the Son, one because the sacrifice is theirs through their solidarity with Christ, and one really and by no figure of speech in the fruits indissolubly connected with that sacrifice, by the participation and transformation into the glorified body of their Redeemer.

In the first chapter, the Redemption was portrayed as a plan of Almighty God to gain a certain end. That end was said to consist in the elevation of the finite creature man into the divine life of the Holy Trinity. The project seemed to involve insuperable difficulties, for how could a creature be finite and infinite at the same time—that is, keep his independent finite personality and still participate in the divine nature, especially, too, as that creature was alienated from God by sin and a debtor to his justice? The solution was worthy of God, and after the

event we can have a never-ending delight in studying it and finding ever fresh manifestations of divine craftsmanship.

If we look at creation, there are clear indications, as St Thomas Aquinas observed, of a hierarchy not only in kinds of being, but in primeval and elemental qualities and relations. There is, for instance, a gradual ascension in the purity and beauty of love and the kinds of union possible between one creature and another. That is to say, that the most perfect love and union which will be found in the Godhead will have its analogy in the hierarchy of creation. Now we have an ineffable union in the Godhead, so close that it is a mystery, though a luminous mystery. On the other hand, starting from creation, we have a union between rational creatures by means of marriage which adumbrates and symbolises the mystery of the Trinity, though at such a remove that we might expect other forms of union to exist higher than that of marriage, bridging the gulf between human and divine love. This expectation is realised in the revelation of the Word made flesh and the Redemption. A unity is achieved of which marriage is a symbol, where we find two in one flesh, one body, and one spirit, a derivative in turn of a union of two natures, one human and one divine, in a single Person; which

in its own turn soars up to the consummate union of three Persons in one nature. The Word the Second Person is made flesh, and the whole world is affected by this condescension and suffers a change " into something rich and strange." The Incarnation, then, gives an indelible significance to all creation, but particularly will this be visible where the Word has fixed his abode, in the life he institutes, the life he chose to lead in a human nature, and in the life of that body which has been sanctified by the Holy Spirit and united with himself for all time. If we look for Christ now, we shall not find him far from the haunts of men, but still incarnate, one flesh and one Spirit with that visible body the Church, the bride. There, as in the old Arabian epilogue, the Lover has said to the beloved: " It is no longer I but you," and bidden searchers after him look for him where alone he makes himself visible, in the Church, in the Mystical Body.

The Incarnation, therefore, revealed as possible, because real, a union between the finite and the infinite. Nevertheless this union was not the goal at which God was aiming. The Word made flesh was one person with two natures, and human personality, once given to human beings, was not to be withdrawn. Hence the Incarnation is the

beginning of Redemption, but not the end; the clue, but not the solution itself. In his human nature Christ suffered and atoned for sins, and the instrument of the atonement became by the Father's acceptance the instrument of communion with the Trinity. Being glorified, it generated new life; it could give of itself without diminution, for the higher the form of life the more is it communicative of itself; just as a human mind of a master communicates itself to a pupil without loss, whereas a natural human body has no such powers. The glorified body of Christ being next to God himself in excellence, owing to the hypostatic union, communicates its life to those who participate of it, raising them to a level which can, with restrictions, be said to be as high as its own. And so it comes about that those initiated into the mystery of the risen Victim become his new body, his Mystical Body, as it is called, to mark the difference between what has no personality of its own but God's, and what is united corporally but with a finite personality left intact. The life of the Trinity is shared by the human nature of Christ, because that nature, though finite, belongs personally to the Son, and the life of the Trinity, too, is shared by all those who are one flesh and one spirit with Christ, for they are one with the body of Christ. They are, therefore,

derivatively united with the Godhead, being heirs and coheirs with Christ.

Such is the plan of the Redemption, and it is all, so to speak, codified and translated into the Mass. In that sacrificial action mankind stands before God, confessing its sins, but already forearmed against the wrath of God by the knowledge of what is to come. It is confident in the acceptable character of the Victim to be offered, the Son of man, and the Word made flesh. The one sacrifice is enacted, the offering is made of the body and blood of Christ under the species of bread and wine, separated to symbolise ritually the immolation of Calvary; and we can picture the Last Supper with the High Priest giving thanks and blessing and breaking the bread, and watch the features of that High Priest change. The words remain, the first person singular of the Head and Author of Redemption, but the face is the face of every Christian priest and every Christian offerer, the voice as of many waters, the new Mystical Body of Christ offering in his name, one with him in that union indescribable, which allows of separate individuality and yet corporate identity, of private gain without addition to the merit and suffering of Calvary, of manifold, ever-growing membership with singleness of life. The Head and members meet

together in that one oblation which brought Redemption and union, and consummate that union in the divine feast which closes the Mass. The bride celebrates in her turn the victory through death which brought her a willing captive to Christ. She glorifies God and appropriates the fruits of the sacrifice and enters fully upon her divine life with the Godhead by becoming one flesh with the body of her Lord.

Many are the consequences of this ordinance of God and the privileges of Christ's Church. Some, indeed, are so illustrative of the argument just proposed, that a word about them is required in the succeeding chapters, but there is one point which is in place here and now. The reformers of the sixteenth century in their zeal to purify the Church of the abuses and errors that had crept in, went back to the primitive conditions for their ideal, and among the superstitious and debased additions to the pure doctrines of Christ they counted the Mass. Hence, Protestantism has never been able to erect an altar to God or offer a real sacrifice. Its priesthood has confined itself, or should have confined itself, to a commemorative service, to the administration of the "Sacrament" and the ministry of the Word; so that, in the Reformation, Christianity lost its

unity and the reformers the Mass. The reformers urged that the Mass as a sacrifice implied that the one sacrifice of Calvary was not complete, that it derogated from the dignity of the one redemptive act, whereas if the place and significance of the Mass have been rightly described, where they found disparity there the secret of Christian unity lay, the unity of membership with the Head. No wonder, then, that outside the Catholic Church there is no unity in Christendom, for human conceiving will never arrive at a substitute for the supernatural unity planned and supported by God. And that there should be a unity is so clearly demanded and promised by Christ, significantly enough, too, at the Last Supper, that its absence is a clear mark of the absence of Christ himself. He intended but one division, and that a symbolic one—the separate consecration, to wit, of his sacred body and blood—a division signifying sacrifice and leading on to the reward of sacrifice, identification with himself. His people are united " as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood," as the Mystical Body of Christ, so that it is as impious to cause dismemberment and schism in this Mystical Body and separate it from its High Priest the glorious Victim, as it is to separate the human nature of Christ from his

Godhead, claiming for it a personality of its own. The Church of Christ is inseparable from its Founder; it is visible as containing the mystery of the Incarnation, it is ever identical and yet ever increasing; it is holy because it is sanctified by the Holy Spirit, the bond of love between God and his elect; it is sacerdotal by right of adoption into the priesthood of Christ by its association with the blood of the Redeemer and its wedlock with the glorified perennial Victim. None of these prerogatives can be ignored, and justly the Church is jealous of its rights, and will not sacrifice one jot or tittle of them or make any bargain for the sake of bringing into the fold the warring sections of Christendom. There is no superfluous dogma which can be surrendered for the sake of peace. The supernatural life of union with Christ is as genuinely and fundamentally dependent on the supreme sacerdotal character and ecclesiastical lordship of the Pope, the vicar of Christ, as on the divinity and body of Christ. The voice of God made man is heard in the sacrifice of the Mass at the words of Consecration, and the guarantee of that identity between the offerer and the High Priest is the sacerdotal dignity founded in the Mystical Body and dispensed by the successors of the Apostles and by the chosen vicegerent of Christ, the successor

of St Peter. And the same infallible voice of God travels down the ages, the voice distinctly heard in the living traditions of the Church and to-day in the clear authority of the high priest, to whose care have been committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

CHAPTER V

CONTROVERSIES CONCERNING THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

WE have dealt with the main objection of the reformers, which was to the effect that the sacrifice of Calvary was the one and only sacrifice all-sufficient and complete, by showing that the Mass is not a sacrifice superadded to that of Calvary, but a continuation of it and participation in it by the living members of that Body whose Head is Christ. Since this Mystical Body is a unity composed of free individual members, it is in perfect accordance with that unity that the sacrifice should remain one and specified by the nature of the Head, and yet plural to allow the free members to appropriate that sacrifice by their own subordinate but individual action. Human nature is shared essentially by each single human being, and yet there is no danger of exhausting human nature, or of one man suffering through another's gain. Given, then, a person of a higher order of being, others can share in the graces of his nature and participate in an act of his subordinately but specifically without detriment to the

completeness of that act, without robbery of his nature. The conception, no doubt, is mysterious and difficult to state, because it concerns an order of love and union higher than language forged out of experience can express. Nevertheless its possibility and its sublime character are sufficiently clear. Less theoretically it may be said that the Mass is one with the sacrifice of Calvary, because the High Priest Jesus Christ ordained a priesthood to offer his body and blood in his name, that that body and that blood are those of the Victim of Calvary and that the Mass is the same act of worship to God and an application of the Redemption to the members of the Church.

But now, within the Church, has been heard the sound of controversy, not, indeed, about the point raised by the reformers, for never has there been a doubt about the truth of the sacrifice of the Mass. The controversy is a domestic one, stimulated certainly by the objection given above, but concerned with the question how the Mass is a sacrifice. Up to the sixteenth century there seems to have been no occasion to treat this question explicitly and finally, so undisputed was the fact of the sacrifice. In the golden age of mediæval theology the Eucharist as a sacrament occupied the attention of theologians, and the precise manner of the sacrifice did not come to the fore.

Consequently an inquirer would have to gather together the vast quantity of scattered evidence in the patristic writings and the volumes of the scholastics. That there is a striking uniformity in the evidence has been proved by the work of Père de la Taille, a uniformity not merely of hints or lines of argument, but of richly stated doctrine. When, however, the question was flung at the Catholic theologians at the Reformation, the shape it took set some of them searching for what could never be found. St Peter Canisius, indeed, and others were not taken aback, and had an answer ready which was decisive and, at the same time, identical with the doctrine which peers forth out of the pages of tradition. But others felt that they had to show that the Mass was a true sacrifice and so distinguish it from the commemorative service to which the Protestants relegated it. The latter said that it could not be a sacrifice for the reasons alleged above, and that, further, Christ had instituted only a memorial of himself, which, if examined, would be found wanting in at least one of the essentials of sacrifice. This essential was the act of sacrificing, of making a victim—that is, the act whereby an object is taken away from common use by destruction, for example, and made over to God. The Protestants, therefore, started the hue and cry which led

certain Catholic theologians to hunt for some action in the Mass which could be called an act of real immolation. Moreover, owing to their adversaries calling the Eucharist nothing more than a commemorative service, a memorial of the Last Supper, these theologians tended in thought to separate the Last Supper from the Passion,[1] and so to prove that the Last Supper,

[1] This statement does not mean that these theologians separated the sacrifice at the Last Supper from that of Calvary, so as to leave no connection between them. All acknowledge a connection. The Mass, which is a rite instituted at the Last Supper, is by the Council of Trent defined as differing from the sacrifice of the cross, " sola offerendi ratione." But there are many ways of explaining that connection without recourse to that unity proposed in the preceding chapters—and just as these theologians find a real immolation as well as an oblation in the Mass, they also found one in the Last Supper before the actual death and immolation of our Lord on the Cross. This is to separate the Last Supper from the Passion. This tendency to divide up what is one has its uses, and it is to be found at recurrent periods of thought, but it is also, on occasions, pernicious. The *disjecta membra* are with difficulty placed together again, and more often are regarded as complete in themselves. It is necessary at times to take a watch to pieces, and it is perhaps easy in that case to remember that the pieces are not each a watch, but its constituents. The philosopher divides up man into body and soul, or reason, will and sense, and experience proves that he may in time begin to talk of the body in terms which belong strictly to a man alone, or speak of the intellect

taken by itself, was a sacrifice, and consequently that the Mass also was a sacrifice.

The argument would then forestall the reformers' complaint by proving that the Last Supper being a sacrificial rite, the re-enactment of that rite by the command of Christ would also be a sacrifice.

It is open to every Catholic to hold this argument, and some of the greatest names in modern theology are to be found among its patrons. The greatest respect, therefore, is due to it, and the force and ingenuity of the modes in which the Mass is proved to be a sacrifice containing a real immolation should not be lightly set aside. If, then, they are rejected somewhat summarily here, it is not for want of admiration

---

thinking this or that, the will deciding, when it is a man who thinks and decides. In what concerns the Redemption and Christianity how often is a part taken for the whole, faith in Christ taken from its context and made to do duty for the whole of Christianity, or good words taken independently of grace and dogmatic beliefs! The bad results of this tendency are well exemplified in the subject-matter of the chapter. In the thesis presented as true, the Last Supper, the Passion and the Resurrection all go together, the Last Supper as the Oblation, the Passion as the Immolation, the Resurrection as the Acceptance. The theologians discussed in the text try to find a real immolation as well as an oblation in the Last Supper, and say little of the Resurrection.

for them, but because they are mentioned chiefly for the purpose of illustrating the point of view held through these pages.

Exercised, then, by the need of finding some act in the Last Supper and the Mass which could be construed into a sacrificial act—that is, an act of real immolation and destruction—these theologians, from the sixteenth century down to our own day, fastened on one or another incident or feature of the rite as symbolising or entailing a real act of immolation. We shall mention briefly some of the most celebrated theories.

1. The theory of Blessed Robert Cardinal Bellarmine. This theory is followed by the theologians of Salamanca, and, according to it, the immolation takes place in the real destruction of the Sacred Host in Communion—that is, the consumption of the Sacred Host is equivalent to destruction, and so the Mass is a sacrifice. The inconveniences of this view are manifold, because there is no real destruction. It is the species of bread which suffers a change, and no one could possibly assert that our Lord is in any sense really affected, much less destroyed by becoming our food, and yet this school maintains there must be a *real* destruction. Again, Communion, by common accord, does not belong to the essence of sacrifice, but is the complement and fruit of

it. In the Mass Communion presupposes the sacrifice already made and accepted, as the Resurrection signifies the acceptance of a sacrifice already made. Lastly, the suggestion that the communicants do in some way or other destroy our Lord and play a part in any manner resembling the Jews who put our Lord to death is not one that can commend itself to the *sensus fidelium*.

2. Less extreme is the view of Cardinal de Lugo, a view also held by the illustrious Cardinal Franzelin, and familiar to students by the words *status declivior*. According to it, our Lord is placed by the words of Consecration in a " more lowly state." In de Lugo's words, " Although the body of Christ is not destroyed substantially by the act of Consecration, nevertheless it is destroyed in a human way (*humano modo*), in so far as it receives a more lowly state and such as to render it incapable of the human uses of a human body." Or, again, in Cardinal Franzelin's words: " Under these species (of bread and wine) all activity depending on the senses connatural to a body's life ceases. It is placed there after the manner of an inanimate thing." " Such an emptying (*exinanitio*) is to be understood not only as true and properly sacrificial, but furthermore, apart from the bloody sacrifice of the Cross, no more sublime and profound idea of a true

and proper sacrifice can be conceived." Against this view the same arguments hold which were urged against the first theory, and with even greater force; because it is difficult to see how to be in a "more lowly state" of this kind can be called a destruction or immolation at all. Furthermore, the sacrifice would be completed by the consecration of one species. But, as with all these views, the decisive objection is that there is no *real* destruction of our Lord's body, no *real* change at all, and all attempts to invent one are bound to founder.

3. This view is attributed to Lessius and Billuart among others, and it consists of the following. By the words of Consecration, a conditional destruction of our Lord is brought about—that is to say, the words of themselves mean the separation of the precious Blood from the body, and consequently destruction, were it not that our Lord's body is in fact impervious to change. To this the objection is, that a condition which is not realised and cannot be realised does not affect the real state of our Lord's body, and therefore there is no real destruction and no real immolation.

4. More subtle is the view of Suarez. He denies that real destruction is required, and yet he is aware that a mere symbolic destruction

is not sufficient. Hence he tries to combine a real victim, without destruction, with a symbolical or mystical destruction. To understand his argument fully his explanation of transubstantiation must be mentioned. Shortly, it comes to this. In transubstantiation an act of divine power separates the accidents of bread from the substance, and as a result the substance, lacking its proper conditions for existence, ceases to exist. A second act of divine power produces under the species the body of Christ, an act which could be called creative were it not that Christ were already existent. For this reason the action is usually called by theologians reproductive, and this very action reproduces Christ as Victim. Our Lord, being in this way reproduced upon the altar, the words of consecration, with their representation of a mystical effusion of blood, suffice for a real sacrifice. To see the point of this argument it should be remembered that, whereas for St Thomas the bread is changed into the Body of Christ in such a way that the bread changes and passes into a new substance, which itself remains unchanged, for Suarez the bread ceases to be, and in its place is produced by an act of God the Body of Christ. By this theory of change he is enabled to declare our Lord is present as a Victim.

The objection to this view is that the change described by Suarez explains neither transubstantiation nor how Christ becomes a Victim. As the change involves reproduction and not production, the body of our Lord is really in exactly the same condition as before, and so it suffers no change which might be termed victimising.

Secondly, this change, whatever else it be, is not transubstantiation, because there is no passing of one substance into another at all. One substance ceases to be, through the deprivation of its natural mode of existing, and another substance is produced. Between these two processes there is no connection, no common term. In the ordinary changes of nature one form is succeeded by another, and there is a subject common to both, with the result that both what is changed and that into which it is changed are affected, the first inevitably and the second accidentally. But where one substance entirely disappears by conversion into another—and this is the meaning of transubstantiation—the first is changed, but the second remains what it was; otherwise the first would still be continuing to exist in the second, and so it could not have been substantially changed. As we shall see, transubstantiation—that is, the total change of one substance into another, so that there is nothing of it left—exactly

suits the doctrine of the sacrifice propounded in these pages. Our Lord is always the same, a perpetual glorious Victim. The substance of bread is changed into his body, and the change is confined to the bread which is converted into the unchanging body of Christ.

5. The theory of Suarez lies midway between two extremes. All the theories except his have demanded some act of real destruction. He demands the production of a Victim and then a mystical immolation. There remains the theory which claims a mystical or symbolical immolation to be sufficient. This view is attributed to Vasquez and Cardinal Billot among others. According to Vasquez, the representation of the sacrificial act performed over the real body and blood of Christ is a sacrificial act. Our Lord is present under the species of bread and wine, and the separate consecration commemorative of the Last Supper and Calvary ritually confers on Christ the status of a Victim. In other words, when the priest consecrates the bread and wine separately, he symbolises the death of Christ, and as Christ is really present under the symbols, this consecration is a sacrificial act equivalent to immolation.

This view avoids the rock on which those above are wrecked. No real change is demanded, for a

real change or a new act of immolation is impossible. And yet the Mass is a sacrifice and requires a Victim to be offered; immolation, therefore, as well as oblation, so Vasquez thought. Consequently he is reduced to a mystical immolation, and is at pains to prove that that is all that is needed. But if, as he thinks, a real Victim is required for a sacrifice, this solution is a failure, because a symbolic act is not a real act, and our Lord is not really immolated, and so there is no sacrifice. For a sacrifice a Victim is required; in the Mass Christ must be a Victim, and yet he cannot be really immolated again, since Calvary is over and he is glorious and impassible. A symbolic immolation will not do, because a real Victim is required. Either Christ is made a Victim really, and then Calvary is added to and Christ is not risen, or he is not really made a Victim, and then the Victim is not a sacrifice. That is the dilemma.

The true solution has already been given, but the perfection of it can be seen much more readily by contrast with the theories just mentioned. A Victim is needed; an act of real immolation is impossible. Therefore the Victim must be present without any new act of real immolation. And this is not only possible, but it is the cardinal point of the redemptive scheme of God. Christ is a

Victim for ever, our salvation is perpetuated in time through all ages, and Christians are admitted into the mystery of the Redemption by the Mass, which commemorates the saving of this world on the tree of the Cross.

And this commemoration is not a mere memorial service of a past event, for the same Victim is offered, and the offering by Christ's members is the only new factor in the sacrifice. Literally we can apply the phrase " All that is mine is yours " to the covenant of Christ with those whom he describes as branches of the vine that is himself. The sacrifice of Calvary is made over whole and entire to be offered and enjoyed by us, an ever-living and abiding mystery, which reveals the closeness of our union with Christ and the true meaning and dignity of membership with one who is God. Therefore, in the Mass the members offer, by the virtue of their Head, his sacred body. That sacred body, once immolated in a bloody manner, has been raised from the grave and constituted a glorious Victim. The words, then, of consecration, which change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, make Christ present on the altar and present in his perpetual state of Victim. The Victim is present and he is offered. But as he is there invisibly, some visible rite is required in addition which will signify

immolation, and this rite is that ordained by Christ at the Last Supper, the separate consecration which mystically represents immolation. By itself this mystical immolation would not suffice, as we have seen in discussing the theory of Vasquez, for a real Victim is required. But it is perfectly sufficient when a real Victim is present. The symbolic action speaks to us for a real fact; what is signified is really present, and therefore we have a real sacrifice, a visible rite signifying an immolation, a real Victim and an oblation. The dilemma no longer presents any difficulty, for Christ suffers no more, and nevertheless is a Victim. The Mass, then, is a sacrifice, and a sacrifice precisely because of its intimate connection with the Passion and death of Jesus Christ.

This view appears simpler and more satisfying than those previously given, not only because it is less open to objections, but because it knits together the main events of the Redemption and shows forth the mystery of Christ's sacrifice, love, and intentions in our regard. The theologians who sought other answers were, be it said with all respect and reverence, led astray partly by the false directions given to their investigations by the reformers and partly by the tendencies of scholastic thought at the time. The period of Scholasticism which closed at the Reformation left a

damnosa hereditas of logic-chopping, nominalistic distinctions and shortsighted analysis. The majestic synthesis of the Christian faith made by a St Thomas, like that of his master, Aristotle, proved too mighty for successors; and they were content with patchwork and could not weave a seamless garment of theology. As a result, the great thinkers who succeeded this decadent epoch were handicapped, and the marvel is that they were so successful and creative despite it. But here and there the exigencies of the times and the secular break-up of thought can be discerned in their writings. In general, it may be said that the propitiatory aspect of the Redemption was before their minds, an aspect minimised by Lutheran faith and Calvinistic predestination. The Council of Trent had had to anathematise those who declared that the Mass was only a sacrifice of praise and act of thanksgiving and not propitiatory, and this condemnation emphasised the fact that all, from the laymen to the Pope himself, had to work out their salvation and that the Mass must be offered as a means of grace and in satisfaction for the sins of the living and the dead. Consequently, the coincident doctrine that the Church was the Mystical Body of Christ, and that its members were in the supernatural order and possessed of that same life by faith which

they would enjoy in its plenitude in heaven, is not so prominent in the writings of theologians. They were exercised particularly by the problems of actual grace,[1] how God *helped* man to save his soul, and in the Mass the propitiatory nature of the sacrifice was the aspect investigated and developed. Now propitiation is a word which implies not only a Victim, but may suggest also a victimising, and the temptation then would be to think of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass as essentially demanding an act of real immolation, in somewhat the same way as now the word sacrifice in most men's minds suggests an act of destruction or an heroic and painful deed of self-abnegation. The temptation would be strengthened if, in the study of the Mass, the sacrifice of Calvary was kept sedulously apart from the Resurrection. Now this is what happened. Heretics had contaminated the doctrine of the Resurrection, and had tried to substitute a commemorative service of thanksgiving for the propitiatory sacrifice. The result was that the doctrines of the risen life, of the Mystical Body,

[1] The obvious example is the controversy De Auxiliis. Of course the part of sanctifying grace was not neglected, witness the great work of such theologians as Suarez, Lessius and Ripalda. In the development of Catholic doctrine epochs show emphasis, but neither exaggeration nor misleading omissions.

of the glorious but perpetual Victim, were not seen synoptically in their intimate connection with Calvary and the Mass. The three great mysteries—namely, the Institution at the Last Supper, Calvary, and the Resurrection—were studied apart and piecemeal, whereas they borrow light each from the other. Such a process has its advantages, but it leads also to false problems, and one of those was to discover an act of real immolation in the Last Supper and in the Mass. The key to the solution lay in the liturgy of the Mass itself, which is for ever recalling the three great mysteries mentioned; the rite is the rite of the Last Supper, the Victim is the Victim of Calvary; while the crescendo of the sacrifice chant till it reaches the triumph of the Canon and Communion is founded on the Resurrection and confidence in the oblation of the glorious Victim who has ascended to the Father. The Last Supper, then, looked forward to Calvary, the offering was of a Victim to be slain, dedicated at that very moment to be the propitiation for man. Calvary is the culmination, the destruction at the hands of the Jews of that Victim offered the evening before by the High Priest Jesus Christ. The real immolation, symbolised by the separate consecration at the Last Supper, takes place in the Passion and on the Cross, so that there

is no need to look for some extra real act in the rite itself of the Last Supper. Christ once and once only was immolated, on the Cross. At the Last Supper he was offered as a Victim to be slain in a rite which symbolises that slaying. In the Mass, also, he is offered as a Victim, slain but living, in a rite instituted by Christ, the same he himself followed at the Last Supper.

Beauty is the splendour of form, and is seen best in the form that gives proportion and order to what is manifold. Philosophers feel that they are nearing the end of this search when they see part fit with part and catch a glimpse of the unity of the universe, when "all things sing together with truth."

Similarly, with the revelation bequeathed to the Christian Church, the theologian can lovingly discern the mind of God the more dogma fits in with dogma, until the full miracle of the charity of Christ and the surpassing wisdom of the divine plan are made manifest. There is nothing tentative, incomplete, disconnected, or diffuse in the economy of Christ. So profound, indeed, and far reaching is it, that one can never say that complete apprehension has been reached, and there is danger lest we be dazzled by the beauty of some part and linger on it, forgetting that it is but one arch of the edifice not built by hands.

And yet if there be any part of the plan which can be said to form a centre whence our darkened eyes can more easily behold the encompassing splendour, that part surely is the Mass. There are gathered together the virtues of faith and hope and charity; there the waters of grace are seen in their source; there is re-enacted the mystery of love which makes a man-God lay down his life for his friends; there, too, does the Church recognise itself, the royal race, the holy priesthood, the Mystical Body, made up of many members whose Head is Christ; there, finally, are consummated the espousals between the bride and the Bridegroom, and a foretaste given of the joys of heaven when we shall be in Christ as Christ is in the Father.

CHAPTER VI

THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH

THE sacrifice of the Mass is the offering of the Victim by the Church. Jesus Christ offered himself at the Last Supper. He suffered once on the Cross, and now he, the Victim of the Passion, is offered by his Church. It is time, then, to consider what this privilege means to the Church.

The Mass is the centre-piece of the Church's devotion and the principle and assurance of its life, and in no way can the loving forethought of Christ be so well understood as in the realisation of the significance of the Mass. Christ died at a certain place and at a certain time, and it might be supposed that even the work of a God made man would be restricted by the conditions of time and place. But it is not so. What concerns every Christian was to be made present in such a way that no one would have to look back upon a far-off event growing more and more dim as the years receded from it. The Redemption had as its fruit salvation, but the fruit if severed from the tree, be it preserved ever so well, has not the freshness

of an ever-present vine, and the means of salvation are a poor substitute for the Saviour himself whom St John saw and handled. Therefore, by an exercise of divine power instigated by love, Christ so provided that those who believed in him should be able really and truly to offer him up, to come to the foot of the Cross and make him their own propitiatory Victim to the Father. He gave his life a ransom for many, but while this ransom was paid once and for all, nevertheless each and every purchased soul could offer in his own person, by offering the same infinite Victim for his own profit. The propitiation was made for no nameless multitude, for Christ calls his flock by name, and the Redemption is as much whole and entire for each single soul as it is for the world at large. The Mass, therefore, is truly the centre of the Christian life, because it is the continuation of the sacrifice of Calvary through time, the adaptation of the Redemption to the needs of men born after the coming of Christ. All may drink of the chalice of his blood, because its fulness is never diminished, and its presence is ensured to mankind. In other words, all love is reciprocal. Our Lord loved his own to the extreme of love, and showed it by the shedding of his blood. This is all that a lover could do; and for that act to be

profitable, there was need of a response, an acceptance, an act on the part of the beloved. Therefore he continues as the passive Victim, and the Church is now active and does her part by reciprocating freely the love of Christ, and so making it complete and efficacious for herself. This response is the Mass, which is the active offering by the Church of the Victim of Calvary and the appropriation of the infinite merits of the Redemption by the priest and the faithful.

From this truth can be deduced the part of the Church, the priest, and the congregation in the Mass, and the fruits each can derive. But before this can be completely understood, the oblation of the Mass must be made clear as being that of the Mystical Body, otherwise a link in the argument would be missing. The Church has the power to offer the divine sacrifice, because it is one with Christ. The Christian is a suppliant at the shrine of God's mercy, but he approaches with confidence, not only because his offering is most acceptable, but because *personam Christi gerit;* he comes in the person of Christ and is, in fact, so intimately related to Christ that his supernatural life is not other than that of the High Priest. He is a living member of an organism whose Head is the risen Lord. This new status of mortal man is the fruit of the

Redemption given to him through the exaltation of Christ from the grave. The Resurrection spelt a new status for our Lord, and that new status is conferred upon all who participate in the life-giving glorified body of the Victim by Communion,[1] and its antecedent and preparatory sacrament Baptism.

The Mass, therefore, may be said to be the holy place to which all the most sublime truths of the Christian faith converge and whence they issue. The sacrificial and a propitiatory aspect of the Redemption is perpetuated by the presence of the Victim of Calvary. By offering up this Victim the world concurs with the wish of Christ to save it, and adds the assent which was necessary as a condition to make the living act of reparation by Christ efficacious. It follows, therefore, that the fruits of the Redemption are laid at the disposal of the faithful in the Mass. Secondly, the primary effect of the Redemption—namely, elevation into a supernatural order of union with Christ and so with the Blessed Trinity—is condition and consummation of the Mass. For only those who are so united with Christ as to be one with him can offer a sacrifice which will be identical with that of Calvary. Were it not in some sort

[1] *Cf.* what was said about the relation of Baptism to the Eucharist, pp. 19-25.

Christ who continued to offer, the Mass would be a new sacrifice and supplement that of Calvary, if such a thing were possible. In fact, it is impossible, for a new sacrifice, being human, would be incommensurate with that of the Son of God. Consequently, the Mass is subordinated to that of Calvary and yet can be said to be identical with it, inasmuch as the participation of the members in the infinite act of the Head is a subordinate act, whose value is derived from the virtue of that Head. The point is that the offerers of the Mass are participants of the grace of Jesus Christ and, in a limited though an exact sense, divine themselves. And the manner in which they are sharers of the divine nature is by their incorporation with Christ by becoming " one flesh and one spirit " with him in the Communion, which ends the sacrificial action of the Mass, as the Resurrection was the complement of the Passion.

From these two truths, which may be shortly summarised as the Church the offerer, and the offerer the Mystical Body, certain consequences can be drawn. The Church, under Christ, is the offerer in every Mass. The sacrifice is made by the Church by the means of priests as the Council of Trent expressly declares. And the reason is that the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, one and inseparable into parts or

fractions. Apart from that Body no one can act representatively or by divine agency. The separated member is dead so far as the divine virtue infused into the Body is in question, whereas the member, when properly functioning, does so by the power of the whole Body. Hence, in every sacrifice of the Mass, no matter whether the priest be without a congregation or accompanied by the multitudes that fill St Peter's, it is the Church as one Body which offers through his ministry. In a true sense, then, the Church is composed of " a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ " (1 Pet. ii 5). All who are baptised have what the theologians call an inchoative priesthood, for they participate in the life and power of Christ, who was Victim and Priest, and are united with him in the redemptive character. He " has made us to our God a kingdom and priests " (*Apoc.* v 10).

This sublime dignity which belongs to the faithful is not always realised as it should be, for the laity are prone to forget that the Masses which are being celebrated throughout the world are being offered by them as members of the Mystical Body, and the fruit of these Masses is increased or diminished by the degree of holiness they possess. The Reformation is again to blame for the com-

parative ignorance of the laity of their sublime privilege, because the reformers wished to destroy the distinction between priest and layman, apportioning to the latter what is not his—to wit, the full sacramental and sacerdotal character—and as a result the Church had to insist on the impassable abyss between the two states.

Nevertheless, it is sad that Catholics are not more aware of their intimate participation in the Mass. The prevalence of the phrase "hear Mass" is an indication how little they appreciate their privilege, for it suggests a service in which they have as little part as an audience listening to an oratorio, and the result is that a congregation is dissociated from its very life, while the Mass becomes for the slack a Sunday obligation, and for the pious an opportunity of practising their private and favourite devotions. This is not as it should be. And, again, how few Catholics encourage that supernatural sense that they are co-operators in the daily mystery of the altar as it is celebrated in every land and at every hour. Virtue goes out from them, for they are one with that company of the Saints, which continues the Redemption to the end of time. Their lives are supernaturally a perpetual intercession; their strength is that of the Mystical Body, in which abides the spirit of the Redeemer, the glorious

Victim. Hence the voice of the Church in the liturgy of the Mass is answered by the unceasing affirmative, Amen, inaudibly spoken in the depths of a soul living in sanctifying grace, and each Christian is invisibly present at the sacrifice of the Victim on earth as he will, in glory, be present at the adoration of the Lamb in heaven.

An appreciation of this truth makes a great difference to the outlook of the Christian. He can feel himself supported through the day invisibly by those who are one with him, by being one with the Victim, and himself can co-operate with his fellow-Christians in the missionary endeavours in heathen countries, in the ministry of the sick, the oppressed and afflicted, in the supplications to God to avert calamity and bring graces to strangers and friends. His life, too, is elevated to a higher order; it is being disposed of by the Holy Spirit in the ever-continuing Redemptive work of Christ, and by union with Christ, the perpetual Victim, all that he does has a eucharistic value, a part in the voice of praise which goes up from the earth to the Father. The sentence of the New Testament, that we should take up our Cross daily and follow Christ, is capable of indefinite application when taken in the context of the perpetual sacrifice of Christ His Mystical Body not only offers, but is offered

with him, and this explains why the Church has always taught the value of vicarious suffering and nurtured special Victim saints whose alliance with Christ upon the Cross and in the Mass has averted the deserved chastisement from a sinning people. In this sense the agony of Christ, as Pascal rhetorically declared, is, in fact, continued to the end of the world.

That the Mass is the corporate action of the Church is indicated in various passages of the liturgy. The priest speaks in the Canon of the Mass of the gifts which " he offers to God for the Holy Catholic Church, for the Pope and Bishop of the diocese and for all true believers who keep the Catholic and Apostolic faith." Again, just before the Consecration he asks God to receive the offering which " we thy servants and thy whole household make unto thee," and after the Consecration, the *plebs sancta* it is which is mentioned as offering. " We thy servants, as also thy holy people, do offer unto thy most excellent majesty of thine own gifts bestowed upon us. . . ."

It is to this *plebs sancta* incorporated in Christ, and bound thereby in the bonds of charity and peace, as the liturgy so admirably teaches after the *Pater Noster*, that every Catholic belongs, and the greater his holiness, the greater is the

holiness of the holy people and the greater the power of the impetration of the Mass. It has been well said that the presence of our Lady on earth after the Ascension must have made the offering of the sacrifice by the early Church ever so much more fruitful and helped to the rapid spread of the Christian faith; and in a less degree, the presence of hidden saints, and the sanctification of many souls in the Church of to-day, draw down upon the world with greater abundance the graces won by the Victim of infinite worth.

But besides being the corporate offering of the Church, the Mass is more particularly that of the congregation, the stipend-offerer, and the priest. The priest holds a twofold function: he is the minister of Christ and also the minister of the Church. As Christ's minister he has the instrumental power derived from Christ of consecrating and doing what our Lord did. As the minister of the Church he is its procurator, and stands in its place and in its name offering the infinite Victim. He is the *organum Ecclesiae electum*, made sacred for the office and with the sole power of performing the symbolical immolation in which the Church's offering is fully expressed and realised. It is clear, then, that this participation in the sacrifice is the most intimate given to any

human creature, and that the Mass can be said, in a sense, to belong to him, as, to use Père de la Taille's image, sight belongs perfectly to the eye, though it is the whole man who sees. For this reason the Church assigns to the officiating priest a grace, which is his own and inalienable, and a power of applying the Mass to some particular intention of his own choosing or supplied to him by those whose stipends he accepts. For the same reason the Church demands uncommon holiness, as witness the words from the Ordination service. In various places in the Mass he asks God to bestow on him the grace to be less unworthy, and naturally so, since the application of the infinite merits of the Redemption depends in part on the holiness of the Church and of himself.[1]

Nearest to the priest in their share in the sacrifice come those for whose intention, as the expression goes, the Mass is offered. These are the stipend offerers, though that expression hides the full significance of their participation. The sacrifice of the Mass is, it must be remembered,

[1] As all Catholics know, the merits of the Redemption are infinite and the propitiatory value of the Victim is not affected by the good or bad estate of the priest, congregation, and Church. Nor, again, is the Eucharist as a Sacrament affected. The degree of holiness in the offerer affects the application of those merits.

after the manner of Melchisedech, and therefore a sacrifice by means of the symbols of bread and wine. They are necessary materials which the priest consecrates by the form of words, changing them into the body and blood of Christ. The faithful, therefore, provide something. In a remote sense they can be said even to provide an offering; for though the real offering is Christ himself, nevertheless, by the mode of offering instituted by himself, that offering cannot be made unless there are present certain materials specified by Christ which are to be transubstantiated. The providers, therefore, of the bread and wine, or their equivalents, can be said to have prepared the sacrifice, made it possible, and to share by their gifts more intimately in the sacrifice.

Add to this another law, that these gifts or their equivalents save the priest the expense of providing for the sacrifice and enable him to live by the altar, as the minister of the congregation and the Church, and we can see how the custom of giving stipends came to be established. The priest dedicated to the service of the altar is free to discharge his duties, while the faithful provide for his wants, and they provide for his wants by sustaining him with their gifts. These gifts are considered as the means whereby he can celebrate the Mass, and so these offerers share in the Mass

by right of their offerings, while the priest offers his Mass for their intentions. In this way it may be seen how the simplified method nowadays of allocating a definite sum of money in lieu of gifts, represents the age-long practice of participating in the sacrifice by providing the material.

In the early days of Christianity it was considered a very high privilege to be allowed to join in this special way in the oblation of the Mass. One of the felt penalties of excommunication was the loss of this privilege, and public sinners, also, were deprived for a time of the right. Significantly St Ambrose wrote to the Emperor Theodosius, after the Thessalonian massacre: " Then will you offer when the power of offering the sacrifice shall have been granted to you. Then, when your Victim shall have become acceptable to God !" It is only natural, indeed, that this special offering should be esteemed highly. The return of the priest for the materials provided or the stipend is to offer the Mass for the intentions of the giver. By this act the fruit of the Mass is first and foremost, if not totally, applied to the benefit of the stipend-giver; and since the Mass is the corporate act of the Church, the prayer and holy estate of all its members are directed to the advantage of one individual.

His name appears in the liturgy at the Memento, and his petition, instead of being that of a private and single almsman, becomes that of the holy and universal body of the faithful united to the sacrosanct and all-pleasing Victim, Jesus Christ.

Within, then, the Church—that is, the Body which offers the Victim—the priest holds by right the first position, and after him come the stipend offerers. Closely associated again with the priest in the Mass are those actually present at the sacrifice. They are better off than those who cannot attend, for not only does explicit and official union surpass the absent and collective assent, but they take an active part in the rite itself; just as, one may say, the server enables the priest to proceed by the responses. The Mass becomes, as it were, the special privilege of the group or family present; they are like the holy women who were near the Cross and were the first to experience its power in their meeting with our Lord in the risen Victim life. The server at Mass speaks for those present; they, through him, carry on the dialogue with the priest at the foot of the altar, telling him to be of good courage, and with him they implore the blessing of the *Kyrie.* In High Mass at the offertory, the deacon recites with the celebrant the *offerimus*

tibi calicem. A little later the priest turns round, and begs his brethren to pray that the sacrifice may be acceptable; and at the beginning of the more solemn part of the sacrifice the faithful once more assure the priest of their collaboration and bid him, without fear, carry out his sacred function. Their Amen ratifies and almost commands. Comforted by their presence, the priest breaks out with the great preface of praise which preludes the coming of the Lord. Fittingly, at the end of this part of the Mass, priest and faithful again break the silence, kept so strictly save for the exclamation *Nobis quoque peccatoribus.* An Amen precedes the *Pater Noster*, and from then onward the congregation is at one with the priest, in the unity and kiss of peace and in Communion.

Such, then, are the varying degrees in which the Church and its members participate in the sacrifice of the Mass. Christ, our Head, the High Priest and Victim, speaks to the Father the words of intercession and offers himself through the Mystical Body, which is himself, by the ministry of the priests and his holy people. All take part in the offering, and to make the sacrifice propitious in full measure for themselves they should, on their part, set themselves on the altar as victims united with the one Victim. All

participate, but the closer one is to the mystery, the more does one ally oneself with Christ and share the fruits of the Mass, first by right of order and dignity the priest, then the stipend offerers, next the congregation, and last the body of the faithful who, when in grace, are never far from Calvary and the risen Victim.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

THE Catholic being identified with the Glorious Victim and the Church being the Body of Christ, it is to be expected that both the individual and the Church should manifest certain traits which will be the outcome or expression of the form of life which is theirs. Actually we know that there have been certain specific virtues which have been taught and practised in the Church from the beginning. Here we can do no more than glance at them to set them in the perspective of the Mass. There are first the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity, and, as we may say, included in them, humility and peace.

Now the Redemption, when looked at from close quarters, reveals to us the intention of God to destroy the partition wall of sin and to reconstitute the human race in divine sonship. Christ, the God-man, through his human nature represented sinful humanity, and nailed it to the Cross. He became the Victim. Thus death died. In rising, not alone was his own body exalted, but he

gave that new life of his to all who would receive him: he gave them power to be the sons of God, and with that same body which had been crucified and now had become glorious, he united them and incorporated them into his own life. The Redemption, therefore, is a diptych with one panel the Victim, the Lamb slain, and its result, death to sin; while the other panel presents the Lamb slain, indeed, but living and giving life and that more abundantly—namely, participation in the divine life. All Catholics, therefore, are adopted into this life, and in them is accomplished the twin reality of the Redemption; they put off the old man, sin; they cast off the slough of the mere natural self; they are crucified with Christ; and their life is, in a sense, a mystical victimhood with the Head, who suffered the real and bloody immolation. Baptism is the visible sign which causes this change, their death. The Mass, again, is the visible expression of the mode of life which is theirs, the redemptive life, though its full significance is not yet fully portrayed, since we are speaking only of one of the panels of the diptych. The second panel gives the complete story. Beside this destructive aspect of the Redemption there is another, the positive and renovative. Dead to sin, man lives to Christ; he rises with him and becomes part of his risen body. He receives

in exchange for the self, once stained with sin, the divine life, so that Christ lives in him and is the plenitude wherewith his now empty soul is filled. This, in the sacramental order, is the Eucharist, a visible sign, again, of something really happening, causing the inflow of Christ into the soul; while it is easy to see in the Mass, which contains or is the Eucharist according as terms are used, the full expression of this elevation of man into the society of the Godhead. In fact, Mass shows forth the twofold character of the Redemption—the Cross and incorporation.

Now from this follow the virtues which are the interior product of the Redemption. Faith is " the substance of things hoped for, the assurance of things unseen."[1] There is a real new life which the Christian possesses, by which, too, he is possessed; he is a dweller in heavenly places, though all that is visible surrounds him and declares to him that he is indulging in mere fancy or mysticism. But his intellect, enlightened, knows better; it holds on to what is revealed and marches in this strange land by its direction, and surrenders its trust in all that is familiar and comforting. Resisting the lure of self, it places its confidence in one who is its new life. By faith we have the substance, but not the perception and experience

[1] Heb. xi 1.

of Redemption and a divine life within us (though heaven help us if we substitute for the massive, dogmatic, and institutional reality a felt experience which is but an ephemeral and self-produced emotion disguised!). That faith spells complete confidence in the promise of Christ, in his power to do what he will with us, and in his love which will guide us and grace us the greater our trust. Moreover, it enlightens our understanding so that the dark staircase between the supernatural and natural is easily traversed, and by intuition we are enabled to discern the sign of the Son of Man in the apparently most trivial and irrelevant details. Like a detective, the man of faith is for ever finding the clue to Christ in the events which to others betray nothing. The secret reality born into the world at the Incarnation and placed at our disposal by the Redemption is known to us by signs. That is one reason why the sacraments are signs of a something inward really taking place. Just as our Lord faded, so to speak, from the Apostles' eyes after the Resurrection and went disguised, so, too, the supernatural life is seen by faith and in the symbols which hide while they proclaim. The risen Christ is visible, but he is seen in his Church, a visible corporation, and in his sacraments which are visible, despite the fact that they hide what they contain.

What was said of faith may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of hope. Faith may be said to belong more to the present. It is the certainty of one's own diviner self growing within one, while hope looks with assurance to the meeting with God and the happiness of that beatific vision. It is not a mere human hope based on impeccable virtue and supported by the assurance that no temptation could overthrow the will. Such self-reliance is either blind or subject to sudden reversions to doubt and dread. Supernatural hope, like faith, is built on fact, on "substance." To be in grace is to have Christ with one, and the divine promise of protection and reward in return for trust. It is, again, an exchange, a surrender of self for something better and more certain. The soul in grace has been told of its inheritance and is an heir to the kingdom. It has already, in St Paul's striking words, "been chosen out before the foundation of the world, being predestinated by the free choice of God";[1] it is already in possession of heaven by faith, and this possession will pass into experience when the period of faith and of growth allotted by God comes to an end. This being so, a depressing fear, a lack of confidence, a habit of anxiety, are so far from being Christian that they are pagan.

[1] Eph. i 4, 5.

The Christian is the bearer of good news, and rejoices like a saint to run his course; he is exultant and mighty, his joy is infectious, and he is for ever "making melody in his heart," confident in the power of Christ and expectant of the hundredfold in this life and eternal happiness in the next. Now in the Mass this attitude of hope supports the priest at the very beginning when the awful sublimity of what he is about to do tends to make him despair. It accompanies him in the *Gloria* and throughout the Mass, issuing into songs of exultation, till the symbols have once more signified a real happening, and the real Victim beneath the appearances is offered to the Father and received as a pledge of immortality, "futurae gloriae nobis pignus datur."

The virtue of charity is the greatest of all the virtues: it can, in fact, be said to sum them up. "Facientes veritatem in caritate crescamus in eo per omnia qui est Christus."[1] Our Lord at the Last Supper not only reminded his Apostles that this was the great commandment he left to them, but associated it inseparably with the Eucharist. In truth, charity does unite the many strands of the Christian Revelation, and in its delineation the features of the one Church of

[1] Eph. iv 15.

God appear, the supreme motive of its virtue and the consummation of the Redemption in the Mass.

"I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one,"[1] "that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them and I in them."[2] These words are often enough quoted by non-Catholics as the highest expression of God's love for men. But that love is conceived in human wise and is little else than an indefinite extension of the intimacies of human love-making. In reality, it is as exact a statement as is possible in human language of a very definite mode of union between God and human beings, a mode which is realised in the Redemption and in the institution of the Church and of the Mass. By this time the reader must know what the precise meaning of the Christian Revelation is: the exaltation of sinful man to a participation in the divine nature obtained by the sacrifice and the incorporation into Christ's Body. Charity is the word of many facets which describes that union. It is a form of union, and therefore of love, Christ being the new vivifying principle, the grace-giver, the life of the soul. He lives disguised, but really in the Church. His individual body, circumscribed once by time and place, confined to

[1] John xvii 23. [2] *Ibid.*, 26.

Galilee and Jerusalem for thirty-three suffering years, is now in heaven and hidden upon the altar. But his new Body, which grows by Baptism and the Eucharist, stretches to the end of the earth and takes no count of time. He appears and makes himself known in his Church and ever enrols new members into it. In the forty days after the Resurrection he prepared his disciples for the new dispensation; he remained out of sight for the most part, and even when he appeared he was not at first recognised. Yet, being no phantom, no mere spiritual reality, but a living human being who rebuked Thomas for unbelief and ate with the Apostles on the shore of the lake, his presence to the end of time would be likewise real, and in a sense visible, though that visibility must demand faith and would rather be a sign of himself than his actual physical manifestation. Love disguised itself and became so one with the beloved object that those with eyes to see would say, and rightly say, "Here is Christ." The Church is in truth Christ, it is the extension of the Incarnation and the Redemption, and the Eucharist is the sign and seal of that union. Therefore, charity means that particular and heavenly form of love and union that subsists between Christ and the soul and between the members one with another. It is manifested in

the Church, the life of the Head with the members visible as he once was visible in Palestine; with dogmas, which are the thoughts of Christ revealed; with emotions and habits and meetings and practices, as Christ had feelings and habits and other visible traits at Nazareth and in his public life; with order and jurisdiction and authority, as Christ spoke openly and with authority and demanded complete surrender to himself. This visible Body, then, is the mystery of Christ, and the spirit animating it is charity, the love wherewith the Father loved his Son, being in it and between its members. It is Catholic, because it is not bounded by time and space. The Redemption was for all, and as the first Adam was the progenitor of the human race, so, too, the second Adam is to give new life to all who will accept him. It is apostolic because the Body grows, but remains unchanged, with the same features, the same voice, and the same animating spirit. The authority is that of the Head, who is to be with his disciples for all time, and that Head being High Priest, and the Redemption being wrought by sacrifice and incorporation and being communicated by means of the Eucharist and attendant sacraments, the priestly power and jurisdiction continue without break from those visible vicegerents to whom Christ committed

them. It is holy because the Church, being the continuation of Christ, is holy in the special sense that the divine life and presence pervade it, and it is therefore essentially something supernatural and august.

Lastly, it is one because it is a Body. And this description is no metaphor. Strictly, the word body refers to that living unity which is the human or animal organism. This organism is a manifold unity. There are parts, or members, or cells, which have a relative independence conjoined with a complete dependence for their own life on the life of the whole. Now the Mystical Body is a higher form of unity, of which the animal organism is a symbol or, shall we say, an equivalent in a different and lower form of being. In the higher organism there is again complete unity, one animating principle, and consequently the holiness, for example, of the members comes from the holiness of their association with Christ. Christ is the life of the Church, and the Holy Ghost, the source of charity, is the bond of union. The one main difference in this Mystical Body from all other bodies is that the members are not so lost in the life of the whole as to be deprived of their personality. Add the image of a commonwealth of free persons to that of the body, and the nature of the Church stands clear. In other

words, as was said in earlier chapters, the Church represents the working out of the plan of the Holy Trinity to make mankind share in their own divine nature and at the same time to leave man's finite personality inviolate. The plan was put into execution by the Incarnation, Calvary, and the Eucharist. Compare, then, piece by piece, this plan with the Catholic Church as it exists to-day. In the Incarnation the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us, Christ was then God and man, an invisible God made visible through the veil of the flesh. He is identical with the Church. He has exchanged the individual life for a corporate life in and with free persons. That is the perfection of love and the sign of the omnipotent daring of God. He lives, therefore, still incarnate, in human wise under the veil of flesh, the visible Body his Church.

Secondly, he died for man, and again that sacrifice is identical with the sacrifice of the Mass. Only, just as he offered himself once to the Father, now because he lives in and with free persons who are one with him, they offer him, an everlasting Victim to the Father in the sacrifice of the Mass, and so perpetuate the divine event which is as essential to the scheme of the Trinity as the Incarnation. The Incarnation, therefore, continues, and the Redemption remains, the first

made possible by the identity of Christ with his Church, the second by the unity of the Head, the High Priest, with the members.

Thirdly, Christ rose again and became the originator of a new life, because we rose with him and are incorporated with him in the Eucharist.[1] To-day the Mass ends in Communion, the visible sign of Unity which also produces unity. By partaking of the flesh of the glorious Victim, the members live by the life of the Head and are made partakers of the divine nature.

Therefore, to sum up, the work of Christ is to be seen in all its splendour in the Church and in the sacrifice of the Mass and the Eucharist. Or, rather, we see not so much the work of Christ as Christ himself, the Word made flesh, the ransom for many, and the giver of himself in charity to his own. God, who was invisible, became visible and remains visible, and where he is there are the marks of his presence—catholicity, holiness, universality, and unity. So where he is, there also we must expect to see him active, but ever the

[1] The proper meaning of these two expressions depends on the doctrine explained on p. 21ff. The Redemption contains a twofold operation in one act. Baptism and the Eucharist signify this twofold operation, and each incorporates; but, by appropriation, the incorporation is given in the text to the Eucharist.

same, wedded to flesh, offering the sacrifice of the Redemption and breaking bread. The Church is visible, and will have no truck with those who search after Christ no longer made flesh; it is one and has ever regarded schism and heresy as an outrage upon the unity of the Mystical Body. With an audacity which would be blasphemous were it not really that of Christ the Head and High Priest, the Church has its altar, and upon that altar offers the God made man under the appearance of bread and wine to the heavenly Father, and with that apparent bread and wine nourishes itself, believing that such was the means ordained by the Son of God whereby it should live and become more and more incorporated into that divine life which is in the Father and the Son and now in us.

That is the habit of the Catholic Church, and that is the significance of the Eucharist.

265.322
D243

D'Arcy, M.C.

The mass and the

265.322
D243